Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

~~279~~
Y
29

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/oldtestamentethi0000revw

OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS

VINDICATED.

BEING AN

EXPOSITION OF OLD TESTAMENT MORALS; A COMPARISON OF OLD TESTAMENT MORALS WITH THE MORALS OF HEATHEN—SO-CALLED—"SACRED BOOKS," RELIGIONS, PHILOSOPHERS, AND INFIDEL WRITERS; AND A VINDICATION OF OLD TESTAMENT MORALS AGAINST INFIDELITY.

BY REV. W. A. JARREL,

Author of "Election," "Liberty of Conscience," etc., etc., etc.

SECOND EDITION.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.
1883.

Entered according to Act of Congress, by Rev. W. A. Jarrel, in the year 1882, in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

All right reserved.

231.517
J37

"What then is unbelief?—'Tis an exploit,
A strenuous enterprise. To gain it man
Must burst through every bar of common sense,
Of common shame—magnanimously wrong!

—Who most examine, most believe;
Parts, like half sentences, confound."—*Young*.

"If to-morrow I perish utterly . . . . I shall care nothing for the generation of mankind. I shall know no higher law than passion. *Morality will vanish*."—*Theodore Parker*, an infidel.

"Μὴ πλανᾶσθε; *Φθείρουσὶν ἤθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίαι κακαί*."—Be not led astray; wicked communications corrupt good morals."—1 Cor. 15: 33.

1.015

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject of this volume—Old Testament Ethics—in the field of apologetics, has been almost wholly ignored or neglected.

Excepting the work of Prof. Mozley, which has been published since the first writing of this volume, there is no work in the English language which especially treats of Old Testament Ethics. Prof. Mozley's work covers but a very little of the subjects of this volume. While Prof. Mozley's work is valuable as a historical work, is fraught with valuable thoughts and arguments, its treatment of the subject borders too much upon the rationalistic ground to be a safe book for the uncritical reader. The statement of Prof. H. B. Smith, in his late "Apologetics"—"One thing is certain, that infidel science will route everything excepting thorough-going orthodoxy. All the flabby theories, and the molluscous formations, and the intermediate purgatories and speculations will go by the board. The fight will be between a stiff, thorough-going orthodoxy and a stiff, thoroughing-going infidelity"—is as applicable to the ethics of the Old Testament as to any other part of the battle-field. While, in the study of Old Testament Ethics, we must keep before us the fact, that it is germinal and preparatory to New Testament Ethics, and, therefore, accommodated to its age, like the New is accommodated to our age, we must firmly maintain, from first to last, that its Ethics are as *pure* as the New, as spotless as the throne of God. [See Chapter I. for full explanation of this.]

On the canonical, textual and literary battle-field of the Old

Testament, the enemy's heavy guns have been silenced. The school of Kuenen, Oort, Colenso, Robertson Smith & Co., is but the dying echo of the heavy German infidel guns of the generation just passed.

Upon the battle-field of physical science and religion the past ten years have witnessed results equally satisfactory to Christians. Recent letters to Dr. Moss—President of Indiana State University—from Profs. J. W. Dawson, Peter G. Tait, Daniel Kirkwood, Asa Gray, Benjamin Pierce, Joseph Le conte, James D. Dana, C. A. Young, men well known as world-wide leaders in science, all prove, in the language of Prof. Dana, it is not true "that the majority of the recognized authorities in physical science are hostile to Christianity. . . . The whirlwind is passing; and it is now recognized by the best authorities that science has no basis of facts for explaining the origin of life from dead matter; and that not a step has yet been taken to fill up the interval between the higher brute and the lower grade of existing man. We are now reaping the benefits of the recent strife, by deriving therefrom clear views of the limits of scientific inquiry, and of the interval between the material and spiritual. These points are appreciated; faith will regain all she may seem to have lost, and go forward to make new conquests."

Science, a scientific journal, lately comes out and says of Herbert Spencer's foolishness: "His Atheistical dogmas are neither founded on scientific investigations, nor in harmony with scientific discoveries. . . . We ask that science shall no longer bear the odium of Atheism."

In the young sciences—if they may yet be termed sciences —of Comparative Philology and Comparative Religion, the investigations by such names as Max Muller, Legge, Bopp, Wilson, Weber, etc., and our own Whitney, have but added

to the same glorious result. And, now, from the grave of thousands of years, the buried witnesses of Egypt, of the Holy Land, as if summoned by Jehovah's trumpet, are arising to rebuke the scoffer and strengthen "the weak in the faith." As "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," so every science, every real discovery, is joined with every other one in war against infidelity. So much is this so, that a leading American infidel, who, several years ago, proposed the erection, in Boston, of an altar "to the Unknown God," comes home, from a two years' tour in Germany—I refer to O. B. Frothingham—and says, "It is better to stop denying, and wait for more light."

This volume is not intended to be an exhaustive treatment of Old Testament Ethics. Yet it is believed that it will give such a comprehensive view of the subject, that the reader who masters it will have a more than common knowledge of Old Testament Ethics. The work is designed to be all that is necessary to enable even the unlearned, in his own mind, to reply to such ethical objections to the Old Testament as are presented by the ablest infidels. At the same time, the work can but give a clearer and more appreciative view of the New Testament.

Should Providence direct, the writer may, sometime, prepare a book intended as only an *exposition* of Old Testament Ethics.

Should this volume meet with a general reception, the author may follow it with a volume, of the same size, now in rough MS., upon the "Comparative Fruits of Christianity and Infidelity."

Praying that this humble offering may be blessed of the Holy Spirit to Christian hearts and the opening of the eyes of unbelievers, I am yours, W. A. JARREL.

July, 1882.

THE DEDICATION.

To the memory of his mother, who lately left him, to "sleep in Jesus," to his children, this volume is especially dedicated by the author, their beloved father, who would rather follow them to their graves than see them infidels—with the prayer for the Holy Spirit to early bring them to the Savior, on whose bosom their father has long rested from unbelief.

W. A. J.

Old Testament Ethics Vindicated.

CHAPTER I.

OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS GERMINAL AND PREPARATIVE TO NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS.

The word ethics is derived from the Greek word, *ηθος—eethos.* The word, in the New Testament, occurs in only 1 Cor. xv. 33. In lieu of "manners," it should be there rendered morals. The word, in the Latin, for the same idea, is *moralis*, whence is the English, morals. Ethics and morals, therefore, are words for the same thing. In this book they are used as synonymous. To stop a moment and notice the distinction between morals and manners may be well. The word manners is derived from the Latin word, *manarius*, signifying art, style, varying modes of action. [See Andrews' Lat. Lex., under *manus.*] "Manners respect the minor forms of acting with others and toward others; *morals* include the important duties of life. . . . By an attention to good *manners*, we render ourselves good companions; by an observance of good *morals*, we become good members of society. . . . The *manners* of a child are of more or less importance, according to his station in life; his *morals* can not be attended to too early, let his station be what it may. 'In the present and corrupted state of human *manners*, always to as-

sent and comply, is the very worst maxim we can adopt. It is impossible to support the purity and dignity of Christian *morals* without opposing the world on various occasions.'"—*Crabbe's Eng. Synonyms. Manners* are forms, standards of action, relate to only man, are made by society, subject to variation and change, according to place, time and age, and may often be disregarded, and, in many cases, should be disregarded; *morals* relate to God and man, are the dictates of right, of God—of the moral law—and must be the same for all people, for all times and ages, and can never be disobeyed or disregarded without doing violence to our moral nature, and incurring the guilt and the penalty due such transgression. "Ethics includes chiefly the rectitude by which man is put in relation, not only with his fellows, but primarily with God."—*Person of Christ, by Dorner, Vol. I., Div.* 1, *p.* 10. See, especially, the third chapter of this book; also, Harless' Sys. Chr. Eth., pp. 4–7. The Bible is essentially a book of Ethics.

"Old Testament morality has essentially a preparatory character—refers forward to a higher, and as yet to be acquired, morality."—*Wuttkes' Eth., Vol. I., p.* 165. That Wuttkes' words, quoted, express the position of representative Christian scholars, of all ages, is certain to all who are acquainted with biblical literature. On this, see Walker's Phil. Plan Salvation, etc., etc. Please here read, carefully, the ninth and the tenth chapters of Hebrews. In these chapters the apostle forcibly teaches that the New Testament is the Old, developed; that "the law;" *i. e.*, the Old Testament, "having a shadow of good things to come;" *i. e.*, of the New Testament. Inasmuch as the Old is the germ of the New, the mission of Jesus was not to destroy, but to develop the Old. He, therefore, says: "I came not to destroy the law or the prophets, . . . but to fulfill."—Matt. v. 17. The

Greek, here rendered "fulfill"—πληρωσαὶ—*pleerosai*—"means to fill, to make full, to fill up."—*Liddell and Scott's, Robinson's Greenfield's, Bagster's Lexicons.* It means to make full, with the idea of development or "evolution." The reader please turn to Matt. xiii. 48; xxiii. 32; Luke ii. 40; iii. 5; ix. 31; John xii. 3; xv. 11, 25; xvi. 24; Acts ii. 2, 28; v. 3, 28; Rom. i. 29; xiii. 8; Gal. v. 14; Col. iv. 12; Rev. iii. 2. In these Scriptures the word will be found rendered by such renderings as, "to make full," "fill up," "complete." In the eighty-eight occurrences of the word in the New Testament is the idea of development.

By his expiatory and teaching life and death, our blessed Savior fulfilled "the Law and the Prophets"—the Old Testament. In his teaching he developed the moral idea of the Old to what we find in the New. Commenting on his words just quoted, Stier says: "My coming is throughout and entirely to conserve, to expand, and to fulfill all the rudiments and tendencies toward the kingdom of God in humanity."—*Words of Jesus, Vol. I., p.* 136. Meyer, a "Rationalist," says this fulfillment of the Old "is the perfect development of the real essence of its precepts." So say the "Rationalists," Ewald, De Wette; so Olshausen, evangelical, *et al.* "And not only in this expression, but everywhere in the gospel, the Savior had no intention to teach anything entirely new, anything for which some point of contact might not be found in the Old Testament, and for which the Old Testament had not prepared the way. It is not with rabbinical hair-splittings, but with simple depth of insight, that he points out in the Old Testament sayings and facts, truths which seem entirely to transcend the stage of religious development which the Old Testament had reached. . . . We must regard the πληρουν—*pleeroun*—as applying not only to the teaching of Christ, but to the whole of his ministry in doing and in suffering."—

Tholuck's Ser. on Mount, pp. 128, 129. The patriarchs had very imperfect and some erroneous ideas of spiritual things. By mingling with the Egyptians four hundred and thirty years (the majority of modern critics maintain that the sojourn in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years; of this number are Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Jahn, Kalisch, Keil, Lange, Ranke, Winer, Tuch, Reineke, Rosenmuller, Knobel, Havernick, Hofman, Gesenius, Ewald, Kurtz, Tiele, *et al;* several of these are skeptics; and Paul, in Gal. iii. 17, probably stated only a practical statement, or as Lange has it, he may have regarded the death of Jacob as "the closing of the date of promise."—Gen. xv. 13; Exod. xii. 40.—*The Pent. Vindicated, by Green, p.* 142), their children had fallen far below what they were. So that, when God took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt, they were a morally debased people, susceptible to moral teaching in only a rudimental, imperfect form. "God can no more *force* an immediate moral enlightenment upon an existing age, and antedate a high moral standard by two thousand years, than he can instantaneously impart a particular character to an individual. He has endowed man with intellectual faculties of a certain kind, which move in a certain way, and with a gradual progressive motion requiring time. . . . The natural motion of the human understanding is by steps and stages; one after another it is weary, sinks back exhausted, and can not go farther just then, but rests, and there is a pause in the progress until another impulse comes; and thus the work is accomplished gradually, and some large and complete truth is at last arrived at. . . . A revelation is accepted readily when it concurs with men's wishes, but the understanding, when separated from the inclination, stops short and refuses to exert itself. . . . This instantaneous enlightenment of mankind by revelation is a wild notion."—*Mozley's Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, pp.* 244–246.

"The Jewish dispensation . . . was both prospective and present in its design; . . . it worked for a future end while it provided also for the existing wants of man."—*Idem*, *p.* 250. (While Mr. Mozley carries this position to a fatal extent, his work is a valuable one, if read with a critical eye.) The Bible reader will have the idea of this necessity of a progressive revelation impressed upon his mind, by calling to mind the slowness and the backslidings of Israel through the wilderness and through their whole history to the new dispensation. Prof. Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D., an eminent, critical scholar, who can not be well accused of "orthodoxy," remarks: "The people were not able to understand or appreciate but a a small part of them at first, and some portions of them were very probably found impracticable or so burdensome as to compel neglect."—*A Study of the Pentateuch*, *p.* 220. If such was their slowness and stubbornness against revelation in its imperfect, rudimental form, a more developed one could have effected only a failure, disastrous to the whole world.

To prepare them to receive the New, there were given them typical atonement, typical penalties, typical priests, typical cleansings, typical salvation—a dispensation of object lessons. To regulate their moral life, a moral law was given, free from anything of an immoral nature, but so accommodated to their understanding, feelings and customs as to regulate them, inculcating, at the same time, better things, preparing them for revelation "fulfilled." "The world was treated for a period as a child that must be taught great principles and prepared for events of infinite magnitude and eternal interests, by the help of familiar and sensible objects, which lay fully open to their view, and came within the grasp of their comprehension. But now we have to deal with the things themselves."—*Typology of Scrip. by Fairbairn, Vol. I.*, *p.* 158. To point out some illustrations of things dimly re-

vealed: 1. Some deny that the Old Testament teaches the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, yet it is there; 2, the doctrine of the Trinity, though in the Old, is not so clearly taught as in the New; 3, the tripartite nature of man, though in the Old, is not so clearly expressed as in the New; 4, demonology is not so clearly taught in the Old as in the New; 5, the second coming of Christ is not taught so clearly in the Old as in the New; 6, the question of divorce is not so clearly set forth in the Old as in the New.

Even the latter part of the New Testament is, in some measure, a development of its first part. 1. In the gospels no clear distinction is made between the *πνευμα—pneuma*—and the *ψυχη—psukee*—the spirit and the soul. But in 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12—which compare with Matt. x. 28, 39; xi. 29; xvi. 26, where no distinction is mentioned—a distinction is forcibly made. 2. The commission was first confined to only the Jews.—Matt. x. 5. 3. This commission was finally extended to the whole world.—Matt. xxviii. 19. 4. In the first period of the New, the Spirit was given in a limited measure; but, finally, much more fully. This explains such words as are found in John xiv. 25, 26; vii. 39, which a few have supposed to teach that there was no Spirit in men before the time therein promised—supposed that, in the face of such as Matt. iii. 16; John iii. 34; iv. 23; vi. 63; Ps. li. 12; cvi. 33, *et al.* The Spirit was not then given in such full measure as at this promised time. 5. There are at least three periods of development of the kingdom of God in the New Testament. The first is, when it was set up; the second, at the larger gift of the Spirit on Pentecost; the third, when Jesus comes in his second coming. These periods are such that each succeeding one is spoken of as though wholly a new kingdom. Compare Matt. iii. 1; xi. 12; xxiii. 18; xxi. 31; xii. 28; Luke xvi. 16; xi. 20; vi. 20, where it exists, with Mark ix.

1; xv. 43; Luke ix. 27, where, in promising a development of this same kingdom, it, at first, would seem to be wholly a different kingdom; and, farther, compare a third development of this same kingdom—1 Cor. xv. 50; Rev. xii. 9–11; 2 Tim. iv. 1. 6. Everywhere in the Bible our present state is recognized as imperfect, while with a pure revelation, only an imperfectly developed one. As revelation, under the Old Dispensation, met with such difficulty in leading, developing the people that they never lived fully up to its teaching, so it is with revelation under the New. The best Christians fall below the high standard of both dispensations.

The New Testament so much accommodates the moral law to our condition, that many evils, imperfections, are now borne with that in the final state will not be known. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye."—Rom. xiv. 1. Some of the Corinthian Church had become drunken at so holy a place as the Lord's Supper; but Paul tenderly endeavored to reclaim them.—1 Cor. xi. 21. An incestuous man's membership rather "puffed up" than humbled this church; yet Paul tenderly led them to do better.—1 Cor. v. 1–13. Such evils borne with, then, in the churches, many now borne with in the best men, in the best churches, will not be known in the finally developed Dispensation.—Rev. xxii. 3, 4; xxi. 1–5. To every dispensation of God, on this sinful earth, are the words applicable: "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual; "*i.e.*, perfect, "but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able."—1 Cor. iii. 1, 2. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now."—John xvi. 12. "I have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing."—Heb. v. 11. We are but a step above those of the Old Dispensation. We are walking only a little; we are

but out of our "a, b, cs" into our "abs." Perfect life, dispensation adapted to only a perfect life we have not, could not bear. The glory of the "better land" but faintly seen; but clusters of its grapes brought across to us. The things which Paul saw and heard, when "caught up to the paradise of God," he was not permitted to utter, doubtless because we are not yet prepared to hear them.—2 Cor. xii. 4. "*Now* are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet *appear* what we *shall* be: but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him."—1 John iii. 2. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."—1 Cor. ii. 10. And, though "revealed" (next verse), they are revealed but imperfectly.

This subject is a fascinating one, and can be here but sufficiently touched upon to enable the reader to see the wisdom of God's plan in making his dispensations but adapted to our imperfect condition. As the old creation was progressive, so is the new—redemption—progressive. Surely the skeptic, who has so worshiped evolution in its very extreme form, ought to appreciate the truth of this argument. Whoever objected to the New Testament because but an imperfect revelation adapted to our imperfect state? Whoever objected to the material creation because progressive in its work—from the lower to the higher? Yet there would be as much wisdom in either of these objections as there is in the objection to the imperfection of the Old Testament. Why not object to these, to human, to parental government, to every progressive work, whether human or divine, because not instantaneously completed, and, therefore, for the time, imperfect? Let us, then, remember that the Old Testament is only an imperfect dispensation—an imperfect revelation—a little children's school. Yet, let us remember, it can not contain anything unrighteous in its

nature or tendency. Like a government bearing with its citizens, parents bearing with their children, the New Testament bearing with its learners—all bearing, educating—the Old Testament may seem to sanction, approve, etc., unrighteousness; but it is only so in appearance. Of all wise governments, in their infancy, it may be written: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come" can never be perfect.—Heb. x. 1. *But let it be emphasized, that neither the Old nor the New Testament, because but imperfectly developed morality and truth, is any the less pure in nature and tendency.* So far as developed, both dispensations are as pure in nature and tendency as the spotless nature of their glorious Author. I trust that the difference between an imperfectly developed law and a law of imperfect morality is now made sufficiently clear.

Inasmuch as the Old is but the New in germ, Jesus says, "Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law"—*i. e.*, the Old Testament—"till all be fulfilled."—Matt. v. 18. With exclusive reference to the Old Testament, Paul says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. Christ and his apostles quoted, preached from the Old as infallibly pure. Being the seed of the New, as the fruit is of the nature of the seed, the Old could not be otherwise than pure. The ablest Rationalist critics have seen the oneness of both Testaments. In his *Characteristik des Hebraismus*, DeWette remarks: "Christianity sprang out of Judaism. Long before Christ appeared, the world was prepared for his appearance; the entire Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of him who was to come, and has come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent

of Christ long before he came, and in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less clear, described the new doctrine? The typological comparison, also, of the Old Testament with the New, was by no means a mere play of fancy; nor can it be regarded as altogether the result of accident, that the evangelical history, in the most important particulars, runs parallel with the Mosaic. Christianity lay in Judaism as leaves and fruits do in the seed, though, certainly, it needed the divine Sun to bring it forth."—Quoted in *Fairbairn's Typology, Vol. I., p.* 34, and, by Fairbairn, from *Bahr's Symb., Vol. I., p.* 16. This statement, coming from one of such scholarship, called the "Universal Doubter," and in his old age at that, is of vast significance.

CHAPTER II.

HOW TO INTERPRET OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS.

To understand the words of the Old Testament, the following are essential:

1. Willingness to see it as it is.

2. If inclined to prejudice, lightness, harshness of spirit, struggle for freedom from such spirit. As Max Muller remarks of arguments of this spirit: "Such arguments may tell in party warfare, though even there they have provoked fearful retaliation. . . . . People who judge of religions in that spirit will never understand their real purport, will never reach their sacred springs."—*Science of Religion, p.* 115.

3. Remember that where we may find things that do not, at first, seem right, a little investigation may place them in a very different light.

4. Do not assume to ourselves infallibility of judgment; possibly, where we condemn, the Old Testament may be right.

5. Remember the truth, known to heathen philosophers, that correct moral judgment requires freedom from sin.

6. Never condemn until after long, honest, patient investigation. If Huxley and Darwin spend years trying to find a connecting link between man and the monkey, surely we ought to be willing to spend time and labor to fairly investigate a book of such claims, and of such momentous interests and results, if true, as the Old Testament.

7. Remember the rule, that when there is room for doubt, charity requires that the benefit of that doubt be given to the tried. If a reasonable explanation can be found, charity and justice require that you adopt it until the contrary can be clearly made out.

8. Remember the age in which the Old Testament was given; try to throw yourself into sympathy with that age.

9. Remember that the antiquities of Bible times are essential to explain many of their doings.

10. Remember that in so old a book as the Bible, the records of what are necessary to place some things in a very different light may be lost or unknown. If you can not at once clear up the difficulties, take the course of O. B. Frothingham, who, after ridiculing the Bible for years, now says: "Looking back over the last twenty years, I, who have stood aloof from all revealed religion during that time, can not but acknowledge that its opponents have made no headway whatever. To my friends and followers, who may feel grieved at such an admission on my part, I would say that I am no more a believer in revealed religion to-day than I was ten years ago. But I have doubts which I had not then. The creeds of to-day do not seem in my eyes to be so utterly groundless as they were then; and while I believe that the next hundred years will see great changes in them, I do not think they are destined to disappear. To sum up the whole matter, the work which I have been doing appears to *lead to nothing, and may have been grounded upon mistaken premises.* Therefore, it is better to stop. But I do not wish to give the impression that I recant anything. I simply stop denying, and wait for more light."

11. Remember that in science, everywhere, there are some inexplicable difficulties, or difficulties that only a coming age may explain.

"It should be understood at the outset, that no one claims that the system of Christianity is free from difficulties, which may here and there be of a perplexing character. This is no more than is admitted by everybody, except narrow partisans, in the case of every science. The same thing is true, I believe, in the law of gravitation.

"There are mysteries which are not cleared up, which Revelation does not pretend to clear up; some, it is likely, that human intelligence, at its present grade of development, is incapable of explaining. . . . The question respecting any creed proposed for belief, whether in religion, philosophy or science, is whether the reasons for it are stronger than the reasons against it. Christianity asks for itself no more than is conceded in regard to every other system and theory, and in regard to events which generally do not fall under the immediate notice of the senses; though even here time and space, sense, perception, and the reality of an external world, are not free from the most perplexing difficulties."—Prof. G. P. Fisher, in *North American Review*, February, 1882.

12. Remember that the design of any law has much to do with its interpretation. For example, if the Old Testament had been given to clear up every difficulty, satisfy every curiosity, and fully reveal all spiritual things, it would have been a very different book from what it is.

13. Compare the statements of the Old Testament upon any point with all its statements which have any bearing upon the same point.

14. Let the New Testament interpret the Old. Being the Old developed, the New must be upon it an essential commentary.

15. Endeavor to pray to its Author for the Spirit to prepare your mind to understand it.

16. Remember that the record of a matter in the Bible is

no evidence of its being right. The temptation of Jesus, the denial by Peter, speaking unadvisedly by Moses, incest of the Lot family, sins of David, etc., are examples recorded to warn, rebuke sin, and show that the best men may fall.

17. Remember that commendatory notices of good men are not to be taken as commendatory of their faults and falls.

18. Often, when men persistently resist God's will, he throws influences around them to blind and harden them in their course so as to run themselves into destruction. In such cases, (1) their own wickedness is the *reason* for God placing them under such influences; (2) God places them under these influences to judicially punish them; (3) by their resistance they harden their own hearts; (4) because of their hardening their own hearts, God, by these influences, hardens them, too, in order to punish them. Thus, Pharaoh persistently resisted the divine will and thereby hardened his own heart; and God, to punish him, providentially arranged the influences which led him to harden his heart against danger, and thereby hardened him to rush into judicial destruction. In these cases, man's freedom is unrestrained. To *chastise* David, the Lord acted upon the same principle, when he providentially arranged such influences as hardened his heart against danger to number the people, after David had hardened his own heart against the divine will. See 1 Chron. xxi. 1; 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. In the same way God rules to-day. The rule may be thus stated: When men harden their hearts against God's will, persisting in wickedness, he then hardens their hearts against danger, to run into punishment or destruction; and the acts of men are thus attributed to themselves and to the Lord.

19. Finally, remember the *moral responsibility* of interpretation. These rules are essential to the right understanding of

either the Old or the New Testament. They are the rules that must, substantially, govern us in the interpretation of any Code of Laws. Says Blackstone: "To interpret a law, we must inquire after the will of the maker, which may be collected either from the words, the context, the subject-matter, the effects and consequences, or spirit and reason of the law. (1) Words are generally to be understood by their usual and most known signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar, as their general and popular use. . . . (2) If words happen still to be dubious, we may establish their meaning from the context, etc., of the same nature and use in the comparison of law with laws that are made by the same legislator that have some affinity with the subject, or that expressly relate to the same point."—*Blackstone's Com., Vol. I., pp.* 59, 61. Says Greenleaf: "The object in all cases is to discover the intention of the testator. The first and most obvious mode of doing this is to read his will as he has written it and collect his intention from his words. But as his words refer to facts and circumstances, it is evident that the meaning and application of his words can not be ascertained without evidence of all the facts and circumstances. To understand the meaning of any writer, we must first be apprised of the persons and circumstances that are subjects of his allusions or statements; and if these are not fully disclosed in his work, we must look for illustration to the history of the times in which he wrote, and to the works of contemporaneous authors."—*Greenleaf on Ev., Vol. I., p.* 328. Kent declares: "It is an established rule in the exposition of statutes that the intention of the lawgiver is to be deduced from a view of the whole, and of every part of the statute taken and compared together."—*Kent's Com. on Law, Vol. I., p.* 510; *Hedges' Logic, pp.* 163–167. By these rules of interpre-

tation this book is written. Unless you are willing to abide by them, you can not do either the Bible or yourself justice. Let the words sink into your heart:

"Within this awful volume lies
The mystery of mysteries;
Oh! happy they of human race,
To whom our God has given grace
To hear, to fear, to read, to pray,
To lift the latch, to force the way;
But better had they ne'er been born,
Who read *to doubt*, or read *to scorn*."

CHAPTER III.

OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS LAYS THE ONLY ETHICAL BASIS.

Like everything else, ethics must have a reliable basis. Superficial, false ethical writers know nothing of ethics or its basis. To them ethics is but common-place observations, maxims, aphorisms and manners, which are subject to variation according to place, times and age. Such ethics (?) they delight to quote from some heathen religion, philosophy or writer, and array against the Bible. Though a purely righteous ethics is indispensable, its basis is, if possible, more so.

Old Testament Ethics is based upon the following basal facts, principles and doctrines:

1. Of God, the supreme moral Governor of the world. —*a.* Moral law is essential to moral government. Without law, no government. Whether in the political, the material or the spiritual—the moral—without law all is chaos. *b.* As law does not make or enforce itself, it must have for its origin and enforcement a maker and enforcer. The moral law, being above man, must have a Being, above man, to make and enforce it. *c.* Authority is indispensable to the making and the enforcing of law. *d.* Indispensable to authority are intelligence and personality, in all government. — See *Webster's Un. Dict.*, under "authority." Steam, electricity, etc., have power, but can not have authority. While there can not well be authority without power, there can be power without authority. *e.* From these truths we must in-

fer that a supreme moral Governor is indispensable to moral government. As well talk of the laws of our country making and enforcing themselves, as to talk of the laws of the moral government making and enforcing themselves; for, in neither case, without intelligent, personal law-making power and authority, could law and government be possible. It is, therefore, clear that what men, who deny the existence, personality and intelligence of God, call moral law and moral government, are not moral law and moral government. They have no maker, no executor, no governor; if obeyed, no rewarder; if spit and trampled upon, no vindicator. Concerning that which the atheist may call moral law and moral government, the best that can be said is, that it is a wise or desirable way of acting upon certain occasions and under certain circumstances, which may be the very reverse upon contrary occasions and under contrary circumstances. That the existence, etc., of God is indispensable to ethics is, therefore, certain. *From first to last this must be maintained.* The necessity of its maintenance, and the superiority of Old Testament ethics in this respect to every species of atheism, appear from the following: "A man can enlarge the principles which he follows; those principles can not enlarge him."—*Confucius*, translated by Legge, *p.* 227. Hume knows nothing of law and morality, but of only customs, manners, etc.—*Hume's Essays, Vol.* 2, *sec.* 4. Among nearly all heathen, this basal fact to ethics but dimly appears and was but rarely and faintly recognized. To stop and show that God is the basis of Old Testament Ethics would be more than a work of supererogation.

2. THE SECOND BASAL PLANK OF THE ETHICS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IS THE EXISTENCE AND IMMUTABILITY OF THE MORAL LAW, IN WHICH IT IS SUPERIOR TO ATHEISTICAL AND HEATHEN—SO-CALLED—ETHICS.—*a.* Under the preceding point

we saw that moral law is indispensable to ethics. Old Testament Ethics, therefore, rests upon the existence of the moral law. Denying the authority of this law, infidels can know nothing of the law itself. As that profound thinker, Julius Muller, remarks: "The most essential and distinguishing attribute 'of the moral law is,' its unconditional authority."—*Chr. Doc. Sin., Vol. I., p.* 35. Under the next—"*b*"—the reader will see that infidels recognize no moral law; that so far as they use the phrase, "moral law," they do so to.designate only changeable, varying manners, customs, etc.—in no two ages exactly alike, and, in the same age, contradictory to each other in different places, circumstances, and with different persons. *b.* Old Testament Ethics is based upon the immutability of the moral law. No age, no circumstance, nothing can make right wrong or wrong right. While certain things may be duties and privileges at certain times and under certain circumstances, which, under their contrary, are the reverse, moral right is always moral right and moral wrong always moral wrong. To lie, to steal, to commit adultery, to slander, to covet, to murder, etc., are sins done whenever, wherever, and under whatever circumstances. Law is not the basis of moral right, but moral right is the basis of law. Moral right is the expression of the very relation and nature of moral things. Moral right existed before the "morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy"—in all eternity. While adopting the words of Grotius on law: "It is not something inward in God or in the divine will and nature, but is only the effect of his will"—*voluntatis quidam effectus*—I most emphatically dissent from his view, that law must not necessarily correspond to the nature of God. Anselm and the Reformers were emphatically right in teaching that the divine will must be what the divine nature is. That the will must be what the nature is, is one of the fundamental truths

of all true moral philosophy. To both the Old and the New Testament Ethics it is fundamental. Otherwise, sinners would as often will righteousness as sin; and angels as often will sin as righteousness. "The will of the flesh" (John i. 3), and the will of the spirit—of the sinner and of the Christian —are contrary to each other. See Rom. vii. 15–25. To will right we must, therefore, while in this imperfect state, be the constant recipients of the experience, that "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his own good pleasure." (Phil. ii. 13.) From man being "in the image of God," from these truths we can but infer that God wills holiness because his nature is holiness—unfallen; just as Satan wills sin because his nature is sin—is fallen. While the law is not the nature of God, it is the effect and likeness of that nature; it is the perfect reflection of his infinite holiness and wisdom. It must, therefore, be as unchangeable as the infinite holiness of the divine nature. Law is the positive enactment of this nature; it is the expression of God's will. Law is God's will, expressed; right is the basis of law, expressed or unexpressed. It may, or may not, become law. Law must have a law-maker, an executor and subjects. It is the expression of the law-maker's will in the relations of subjects to each other and to himself. Were there no beings but himself, while he would do right, he would express his will to none, and, therefore, then no moral law. Of course, as subjection to law implies a higher power and authority than the subject, as God is the supreme power and authority, he is not subject to law. Being infinitely holy, he can never be else than infinitely holy in all his works. Should the objection be here raised, that as law is the positive enactment—expression of the divine will, without such enactment man would not have been subject to any moral law or moral government, the answer is: this is conceded. For without law there can be no

government. But, as the divine plan was to make man the subject of his moral government, such an anomaly could not have been. As well urge that because positive enactment is necessary to human government, there would have been no such government without positive enactment; for God's plan comprehended both moral and human law to govern man. Law, then, being the expression of the holiness of the immutable, divine nature, it can never be relaxed or changed.

As God's nature must forever will only moral right, his law can never be other than the expression of moral right. As Hooker expresses it: "Of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is in the bosom of God; her voice, the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage—the very least feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempt from her power; both angels, and men, and creatures, of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."—*Eccl. Pol., B. I., p.* 106. Without this law, knowing only manners, customs, circumstances and conditions as our standard of life, there is nothing that may not become "right." Sad is the condition of the world, as viewed from infidel notions of right. B. F. Underwood, a representative infidel, says: "The materialist maintains that good and evil are only relative terms"—*i. e.*, not real; "that the former designates actions and events that, on the whole, are advantageous to man; while the latter designates actions that are injurious in their results Man has learned in the school of experience what promotes his happiness and what diminishes his enjoyments. The one he calls good, the other evil. . . . The true foundation for all morality is utility"—*i. e.*, not law.—*Materialism, by Underwood, pp.* 14, 15. Thomas Hobbes taught that, "Only what we experience is true; that good and evil is the agreeable or

disagreeable state of the individual person, and, hence, is determined by our immediate feelings, and has, in no sense, a general significancy beyond the individual person; that what is good for one is not good for another; hence, in regard to good, there can be no general decision. Every one determines this according to his feelings or experience."—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 304. The closing remark of the historian of the dark period of the Judges is a good summary of the results of such immoral standards: "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was *right in his own eyes.*"—Judges xxi. 25. Hobbes, therefore, held that whatever was not "prescribed by the king is morally indifferent."—*Macaulay's Hist. Eng., Vol. I., p.* 53; *Lecky's Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. I., pp.* 11, 122. On page 306, of his *Study of Sciology*, Herbert Spencer acknowledges the foolishness of his own doctrine—infidelity: "A utilitarian system of ethics can not at present be thought out even by the select few, and is quite beyond the reach of many." Of course, Spencer's plea, that the theological code is so formed, is utterly without reason. Of morality: "This standard is constantly changing, and that it is never precisely the same even in the most similar countries, or in two successive generations even in the same country. The opinions which are popular in any nation vary"—it would seem from this that Mr. Underwood missed the mark widely, when, in the quotation above, he stated that "the school of experience" had settled right and wrong —"from year to year; and what in one period is attacked as a paradox of heresy, is in another welcomed as sober truth; which, however, in its turn, is replaced by some subsequent novelty."—Buckle, in his *Hist. Civ., Vol. I., p.* 129. Hume taught, that "General and necessary moral ideas there are none; hence, moral conceptions have always a varying worth and rest essentially upon custom."—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.*

212. Voltaire taught, that "Incest, under certain circumstances, between father and daughter, may be allowable; that falsehoods uttered out of a good purpose are legitimate; and the same thing holds good of almost everything that is unallowable. . . . To the objection, that with so uncertain a basis, one might seek his own welfare by stealing or robbing, etc., Voltaire has the ready answer: 'Then he would get hanged.'"—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 319, quoted from *Voltaire's Works, Paris*, 1830. Under divisions "3" and "4" of this chapter, this position of infidels more fully appears. That these infidels, from which the foregoing quotations are made, represent infidelity, can not be questioned by any honest man who is familiar with infidel writings, of any age. From their denial of God, the only basis of law, their position could not be other than a repudiation of all moral law and moral government.

In heathenism we find acknowledgment of the moral law but feeble; and in China, as represented by Confucius and Buddhism, the moral law is unknown—only mere aphorisms, as policy; and these, often, from purely selfish motives. Thus Confucius says: "Among us . . . the father conceals the misconduct of his son, and the son conceals the misconduct of the father. Uprightness is to be found in this."—*Works of Conf.*, translated by Legge, *p.* 205. "A man can enlarge the principles which he follows; those principles do not enlarge him."—*Idem, p.* 227. Though himself an infidel, Lecky refutes his own side, that it is to the interest of man to always do right, from earthly motives. He says: "The plain truth is, that no proposition can be more palpably and egregiously false than the assertion that, so far as this world is concerned, it is invariably to the happiness of man to pursue the most virtuous career."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. I., p.* 63. To attempt to weaken the force of Lecky's statement by taking

issue with him, can not help the infidel cause; for, if such an able writer as he can not see that it is for our happiness to always live virtuous, how can it be proved that the law of nature is clear? Concerning God, Max Muller says: "Buddha seems merciless. It is (the idea of a personal creator) not only denied, but even its origin, like that of an ancient myth, is carefully explained by him with the minutest detail." —*Sci. Relig.*, *p.* 171. But the great doctrine of the existence and the unchangeableness of the moral law and the moral government are too well known as basal to Old Testament Ethics to require that they should here be shown to be in the Old Testament.

3. OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS IS BASED UPON THE DOCTRINE OF HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY.—Old Testament Ethics, based essentially upon the doctrine of man as a subject to God's moral government, is, therefore, based upon his moral responsibility. The former contains the latter. See especially Psalm li., as but one of thousands of illustrations of human responsibility with which the Old Testament teems. After what we read under the last point, to here stop to prove that infidelity repudiates human moral responsibility would be imposing on the reader. Denying the moral law, denying the moral government, infidelity denies human moral responsibility. See the next point, also.

Of course, as to the heathen, their hold upon the doctrine of man's responsibility can but correspond to the feebleness with which they hold to the moral law. As Wuttke remarks: "The consciousness of guiltily incurred moral depravity of unredeemed humanity, which gives to Christian morality a so deeply earnest background, finds in heathendom but faint and delusory echoes. To the Chinese all reality is good. . . . To the Indian all existence is equally good and equally evil; equally good, in that all reality is the divine existence itself;

equally evil, in that it is at the same time an untrue and illegitimate self-alienation of the solely existing Brahma, or, with the Buddhists, an expression of absolute nullity. The guilt lies not on man but on God, and on existence in general."—*Eth., Vol. I., p.* 42. The—one Gibraltar of ethics—doctrine of moral responsibility of man, if in nothing else superior as an ethical book to atheism and heathenism, leaves the Old Testament infinitely above them both. The German philosopher Kant, the greatest philosopher of modern times, expressed the feelings of the best of all ages, and the power of this great doctrine over men, when he said: "There are two things that always awaken in me, when I contemplate them, the sentiment of the sublime; they are the starry heavens and the *moral nature of man.*"

4. OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS BASED UPON THE MORAL NATURE OF MAN AND THE RECOGNITION OF THE REALITY OF SIN.—Man's moral nature is clear from his moral responsibility, for moral responsibility belongs to none of the lower creation, however near they may seem to have been created to man. The Hebrew word for sin, חָטָא—*chata*—and its family, means "to miss, not to hit the mark, . . . to make a false step," and from this, "to sin; *i. e.*, to err from the path of duty and right, . . . to incur as penalty."—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* Its occurrences in the Old Testament are nearly five hundred, nearly all of which point to violation of moral law. There are other words rendered sin, עָוֹן—*avon*, פֶּשַׁע—*psha*, אָשַׁם—*asham*, occurring a few times, the latter in a generic way, conveying the same moral idea. They indicate the same idea that the New Testament word ἁμαρτια—*hamartia*—for sin, indicates. Of course, as the Greeks had but feeble ideas of sin, ἁμαρτια—*hamartia*—attained only its full moral idea by its adoption into Christian ethics—first into the Septuagint,

then into the New Testament. Rationalists, as De Wette, Hupfeld, Gesenius, agree that these words indicate the moral idea. [See Chr. Doc. Sin, Vol. I., pp. 92–94, 199–203, by Julius Muller. Compare Ges. Lex. Heb. on them all; Hengstenberg and Hupfeld on Psalms, *et al.*] "To do evil in the presence of a revealed God, is to sin against God. (חָטָאתִי לֵאלֹהִים Gen. xxxix 9; Comp. xiii. 13; ii. 6.) And this is not merely as the form of the consciousness developing itself under the law, but in consequence of express declaration, 'Whosoever hath sinned *against me*, him will I blot out of my book' (אֲשֶׁרחָטָא־לִי Exod. xxxii. 33), a repetition of that which was spoken to our first parents, and suspended over them.—Gen. iii. 8. Hence, also, the confession, 'We have sinned against thee.'—Deut. i. 41. With the law begins the consciousness of being debtors. . . . In this mutual relation, the discord which necessarily exists between holiness and unholiness reaches its acme, and, at the same time, is fully revealed: sin has showed itself in its true nature."—*Harless' Chr. Eth., p.* 112. Sin implies, first, a Supreme Ruler to sin against; second, a law from him to violate; third, a moral being to violate that law. Without a being, above man, against whom to sin, he could only *trespass* on the rights of his fellow creatures. All sin, as sin is violation of *moral* law, is a strike at its Maker and Authority; is against only God, as he only is its Maker and Authority. As sin is "transgression of the law;" if no moral law—nothing but the few expressions of human legislation and manners and customs—there could be no sin—no transgression of moral law; and if no beings of a moral nature, there could be no violation of moral law—sin. Old Testament Ethics brings this out on every page. In its over five hundred occurrences of words for sin, its expressing sin in other and endless ways, like thou-

sands of fire-bells, the Old Testament, in the sinner's ear, sounds the alarm of the "fire that is not quenched."

a. Infidelity knows nothing of "what is man," of a moral nature; it knows only a higher developed animal, yet just high enough to not reach the realm of moral responsibility. Haeckel, the ablest and leading infidel materialist of Germany, says: "Between the most highly developed animal souls, and the lowest human souls, there exists only a small quantitative, but no qualitative, difference."—*Hist. Creation, Vol. II., p.* 362. Carl Vogt, a representative infidel of Germany, says that it is "presumption in man to pretend to be anything essentially different from the brute; man belonged originally to the ape race, and has only gradually developed somewhat more highly. Man is guided and impelled, just as the brute, by his own nature; that is, by the law of his material existence, and with inner irresistible necessity; the distinguishing between morally good and evil actions is merely self-deception." —*Quoted by Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 355. Moleschott, another representative German infidel, remarks: "To comprehend everything, involves also the justifying of everything." —*Idem et ibid.* On the ground of the brute nature of man, Moleschott deprecates the Christian and Hebrew tenderness and humanity in burying their dead, and says that they "should be used for manuring the fields."—*Ibid.* From the infidel doctrine of the origin and nature of man, moral nature, moral responsibility, even were there a moral law, is as impossible as impossible can be; for, how is it possible for man to be a moral being, because a little higher in the scale of development than the highest brute? As well talk of the highest brute, below man, being responsible, or more responsible, than its jelly ancestor! On infidel ground, there is no more moral law to restrict the sexual, and the other relations of human beings to each other, than there is such law to restrict

the lower order of brutes—if man is a brute. Hence, cannibalism, the destruction of the weak by the strong, etc., are as destitute of moral quality with man—the higher brute—as with the lower brutes.

"The moral sparing of man as an object of moral activity, presupposes that we have to do with real men, men who are not only similar to us, but who are bound to us as members of our body. To creatures which, while belonging to the zoological order bimana, and, while differing from the ape in formation of the skull and feet and by an erect walk, yet who should have been from old distinguished in origin and also in their spiritual nature from the so-called nobler race of whites, we could not come into the same moral relation as to those who are our brethern. The question as to the origin of the races of men has a deep moral significancy, and is of a fundamental importance for ethics."—*Eth., Vol. II., p.* 152.

Max Muller says: "What distinguishes man from all other creatures, and not only raises him above the animal world, but removes him from the confines of mere natural existence, is the feeling of sonship" (not of apeship, or son of an ape or tadpole) "inherent and inseparable from human nature. That feeling may find expression in a thousand ways, but there breathes through all of them the inextinguishable conviction, It is He that made us" (not ape or evolution), "and not we ourselves.'"—*Max Muller's Chips, Vol. I., p.* 351.

"Lecky remarks: "Nature does not tell man that it is wrong to slay without provocation his fellow-man."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 19.

Hence, Carl Vogt declares, "all so-called sins and crimes are only consequences of a defective nutrition, and of an imperfect organization of the brain; hence, there can be no manner of moral responsibility."—*Wuttke's Eth. Vol. I., p.* 355. According to such immoral theories, in giving the young

wives of old men to young men to raise up children for the State, ancient Greece was more than justifiable; and, in murdering deformed infants and old and infirm parents, the ancient heathen were charitable, in that they saved them much suffering, and, at the same time, were more economical than ourselves, as they thus saved their labor and money for better use than in wasting it upon those who could never be other than a burden to themselves and to others. Be not startled; infidelity boldly swallows, avows, such consequences. Prof. Haeckel, a learned infidel, a professor, of the nineteenth century, in one of the learned German universities, in Vol. I., p. 173, of Hist. Creation, makes a commendatory allusion to the Spartan custom of destroying invalid offspring—commending the most cruel murder! Commenting on Herbert Spencer's "Data of Ethics"—Spencer is a leading infidel—the *Nation* well says: "If now, I, a defective and imperfectly evolved creature, full of joy and battle and other survivals from a savage state, say to Mr. Spencer, 'I know nothing of your highest life, or knowing it, despise it;' and if I add to my other riotous deeds the sneering at evolution and the writing of sarcasm on its eventual milk-and-water paradise, saying, I prefer to go on as my ancestors and enjoy this delicious mess of fears and strivings, and agonies and exultations, of dramatic catastrophes and supernatural visions, of excesses, in short, in every direction which make of human life the rich contradictory tissue of good and evil it now is, how shall Mr. Spencer reduce me to order or coerce me to bow the knee? He is impotent over me by any theoretical appeal, and frankly confesses as much. Moral *obligation* he admits (p. 128) to be a transitory element in the moral life, and he tries with considerable originality to show how the sense of it arises by associations of wrong conduct with external natural penalties and social restraints. With advancing

evolution and increasing orderly spontaneity, the coerciveness of the *ought* will little by little disappear. Even now I *ought* to do a thing only on *condition* that I dread certain consequences from not doing it. I do not happen to dread them, I go free. This polemically weak point Mr. Spencer shares with all hedonistic or otherwise confessedly subjective systems of morality. His only superiority over them is this, that he has one more material bribe to offer men in behalf of virtue than they, one more bugbear to deter them from vice. Your way will inevitably fail, he can say. Evolution's fatal tide will leave you naked, and high and dry, unless you join it. But if I am so ill-conditioned as to prefer to remain alone as a spectacle of impotent perversity to the ages, his *arguments* are at an end, and he must resort to brute force, if to anything, in order to lead men at his chariot wheel." But this critic on Mr. Spencer has not urged more than half; for history shows that [see Lecky's Europ. Mor.] men, without the aid of the Bible, have never agreed what should —no *ought* here —be done. [See, also, "2," in this chapter, and "*b*."]

Commenting on Shelley's tribute to man, Mr. Mozley truly remarks: "Had the poet been asked whence he got this idea of man, this sense of the dignity of man, of how much there was in him, and what was due to him, he could not have pointed to a single ancient philosopher as his teacher. The ancient world had no such idea, and had such a notion been suggested to one of its luminaries, he would have scouted it as visionary and fantastic. The poet has got this idea out of the Bible, however reluctant he might be to own it. It does not elsewhere exist but only in revelation and the derivatives from revelation. This is a mattar of fact."—*Ruling Ideas of Early Ages, p.* 233.

b. Infidelity, therefore, as appears in the foregoing, mocks at the very idea of the existence of sin.

If the reader will bear with me, I will add the statements of other infidels. Bolingbroke, the "chief representative" of infidelity, of the seventeenth century, in England, taught that shamefulness is only an aspiration of something better than the brute, as it is a mere social prejudice; polygamy is not immoral; on the contrary, it harmonizes with the law of nature; wedlock communion is disallowable only between parents and children, for the highest law and end of marriage is propagation."—*Wutike's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 313. Robert Owen, a leading American infidel, during the first of our century, remarked: "Now we are so formed that we may not have any kind of control in the formation of ourselves, of our physical propensities, of our intellectual faculties and properties and qualities. . . . It is said that there is no difference between men, and that is true. . . . But whether superior or inferior, they were not designed by the individual possessing them, and he can not, therefore, deserve any merit or demerit for having them, or be made, without great injustice, responsible for them."—*Campbell-Owen Debate, p.* 41. Buckle, not long deceased: "The offenses of man are not so much the vices of the individual offender, as the society in which he is thrown. . . . The moral actions of men are the products, not of their own volitions, but of their antecedents."—*Hist. Civ., Vol. I., p.* 22. According to Mr. Buckle & Co., instead of the law hanging the criminal, it ought to hang "the society in which he is thrown;" and instead of hanging "the society in which he is thrown," it ought to hang the society in which his "society is thrown;" instead of hanging that "society," hang its "volitions and antecedents!" The explanation of the difficulty here implied, is: Man is never *governed*, but only *influenced* by circumstances. Man is *forced*

to obey government; to influences he is *free* to yield or not yield. In an American infidel book, entitled "Poems of the Inner Life," one of its doggerels reads: "Evil is of good, born of God and no other." For Charles XII., whom Buckle characterizes as, "his only merits, that he had ravaged many countries and killed many men" (*idem*, *p.* 576), Buckle says that Voltaire's "admiration was unbounded." — *Idem*, *p.* 577. Again: "Not only does Voltaire dwell at needless length upon the debaucheries of Louis, . . . but he displays evident disposition to favor the king himself, and to protect his name from the infamy with which it is covered."—*Idem*, *p.* 579. Le Play quotes Voltaire: "The private life of Louis XIV. has furnished a model for men as it has sometimes for kings." —*Orginazition Labor*, *p.* 105. Voltaire's "Pucelle" was only a sneer at virtue, many parts of which are polluted with the grossest obscenities.

Even to his own corrupt age his private life was a scandal. The youthful mind of France, Diderot—a leading infidel—with indecent novels polluted. His lawful wife he abandoned, and formed an attachment first with Mme. Prussiux, and then with Mlle. Voland. The French Encyclopedists, the literary men of France for the forty years preceding that horrible revolution, were infidels, and fired the hearts of France with lust and blood, which filled France with the darkest days the world has ever witnessed. Knowing nothing of virtue and morality, they made no discrimination between the tyranny of Jesuitism and between morality and virtue. Before strong but immoral minds, Jesuitism and *morality* were equally swept from France. See *Buckle's Hist. Civ.*, *Vol. I.* Even Buckle characterizes much of this infidel literature as "shameless productions."—*Idem*, *Vol. I.*, *p.* 170. See *Le Play's Org. Labor*, *pp.* 159, 160, etc. As one of the many sources, the reader made find in *Gregg's Literary and Social Judgments*—the

work of an infidel—illustrations of the immoral results of infidel writers in France for both the past and the present. Of the period in the life of Goethe, the great German poet, before he turned from infidelity, Joseph Cook remarks that "he was incapable of surrender to the moral sentiment."—*Cook's Biology, p.* 278. Commenting on Goethe's life, when, as an infidel, he read and adopted another infidel's view for suicide, and when he says: "Among a considerable collection of arms, I possessed a costly, well-ground dagger. This I laid nightly beside my bed; and, before extinguishing the light, I tried whether I could succeed in sending the sharp point an inch or two into my breast"—the time when all was gloom to him; and commenting on the change, and on a book he wrote before and on one he wrote after the change from infidelity—commenting on the life, thus before he abandoned infidelity and after, the late lamented Thomas Carlyle says: "A very wide and very important interval divides *Werter*—the book written while an infidel contemplating suicide—with its skeptical philosophy and 'hypochondriacal crochets,' from Goethe's next novel, *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, published some twenty years afterward. This work belongs, in all senses, to the second and sounder part of Goethe's life; and may indeed serve as the fullest, if, perhaps, not the purest impress of it. . . . For he has conquered his unbelief; the ideal has been built on the actual; no longer floats vaguely in darkness and regions of dreams; but rests in light, on the firm ground of human interest and business. For Goethe has not only suffered and mourned, in bitter agony, under the spiritual perplexities—an infidel age—but he has also mastered these; he is above them, and has shown others how to rise above them. At one time we found him in darkness, and now he is in light; he was once an unbeliever, and now he is a believer. . . . How has this man, to whom the world once offered nothing but black-

ness and despair, attained to that better vision which now shows it to him; not tolerable only, but full of solemnity and loveliness?"—*Carlyle's Essay on Goethe.* Verily, instead of, as an infidel, lying down to sleep with his dagger to murder himself, he has come as a saint to say: "I will both lay me down in peace and sleep" (Ps. iv. 8); "Great peace have all they which love thy law" (Ps. cxix. 165); "Happy is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the *scornful*" (Ps. i. 1–3). The sweet invitation he has accepted—"Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price."—Isa. lv. 1. The darkness of immorality and skepticism Goethe had thrown away for the sweet, life-giving fountain of Old Testament Ethics.

Having passed through something of the same experience, Carlyle could rejoice in Goethe's change. Says Emerson: "Every man is indebted to his vices; virtues grow out of them as a fruitful plant grows out of manure. There is hope for the reprobate, and the ruffian, in the fullness of time." "To say that the majority of men are wicked, is only to say that they are young."—*Fables Inf.*, *p.* 104, quoted from *The Central Herald.** According to this, we need but plenty of vice—"manure"—to have plenty of virtue! Theodore Parker, a representative American infidel, and to whom we are

*Since writing, Mr. Emerson has gone to give an account to the Just Judge. While it is with pain and sorrow, yet with boldness I must reiterate the words of Jesus, as applicable to Emerson as to Paine and Ingersoll: "He that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 16. I feel conscientiously bound to add this note, as a kind but firm rebuke to the "uncertain sound," given by some orthodox pens, with reference to Mr. Emerson while living, and especially since dead. Because of his refinement and influence, few infidels have done the harm that, it is feared, Mr. Emerson has done.

indebted (?), more than to any other man, for the translation and transfer of the fearful German literature and infidelity that so cursed Goethe, says: "No sin can make an indelible mark on what we call the soul."—*Weiss' Life of Parker, p.* 149. Any one would think, from the life of nearly all leading infidels, that they really believed this. Of Parker, Joseph Cook says: "He held that, at the last analysis, sin is a defect of the judgment, or a necessary incident in our moral development; and that, therefore, 'every fall is a fall upward.' The phrase, I think, has often been cited as typical of Parker's thought. Again, said Parker: 'To the wickedest life there is no failure.'"—*Cook's Orthodoxy, pp.* 121, 122; *Frothingham's Life of Parker.* According to Parker's, Emerson's doctrine—the very same as all we have been noticing of all infidelity; and before me lies an infidel prayer to the devil, expressing the same, taken from an infidel paper, the *Banner of Light*, of December 21, 1861, found in *McDonald on Spiritualism*—when Guiteau murdered the President, he committed only what was a "*necessary* incident in our moral development;" and met with one of those falls which is "a fall upward." Over Guiteau's grave may, accordingly, be written the words of Parker: "To the wickedest life there is no failure." Tom Paine's life was one of rascality, licentiousness, profanity, scoffing and drunkenness. Within the last few years I have collected any amount of evidence to prove this, and expose the cunning attempt to rake off him the filth with which he covered himself. Of Paine, John Adams remarked: "If he was the author of the American Revolution, I desire that my name may be blotted out forever from its records."—*John Adams' Works, Vol. VI., p.* 168. For Paine's character, see *John Adams' Works*, also, *Vol. IX., p.* 627; *old edition of Encyclop. Brit., Vol. XVII., p.* 45; *Dyckinck's Encyclop. Am. Lit., Vol. I., p.* 200; *Hildreth's Hist. U. S., Vol. I., p.* 696; *Vol.*

II., *p.* 456. Even an infidel, Byron, learning that Paine's bones were secretly carried away to England by Cobbett, wrote:

> "In digging up your bones, Tom Paine,
> Will Cobbett has done well;
> You'll visit him on earth again,
> He'll visit you in hell."

Of the licentiousness of French infidelity, Hume approvingly says: "Our neighbors, it seems, have resolved to sacrifice some of the domestic to the social pleasures; and to prefer ease, freedom, and an open commerce, to a strict fidelity and constancy; these ends are both good and are somewhat difficult to reconcile."—*Hume's Essays, Vol. II., p.* 389. Says Andrew Fuller: "Herbert, Hobbes, Shaftesbury, Woolston, Tyndall, Chubb and Bolingbroke, are all guilty of vile hypocrisy in professing to love and reverence Christianity, while they are employed in no other design than to destroy it. The morals of Rochester and Wharton need no comment. Woolston was a gross blasphemer. Blount solicited"—by the way, Tom Paine stole most of his vile stuff from *Blount's Oracles of Reason*—"his sister-in-law to marry him, and, being refused, shot himself. . . . Voltaire, in a letter now remaining, requested his friend D'Alembert to tell for him a direct and palpable lie, by denying that he was the author of the *Philosophical Dictionary*. . . . Collins, though he had no regard for Christianity, yet qualified himself for civil office by partaking of the Lord's Supper. Shaftesbury did the same, and the same is done by hundreds of infidels to this day. . . Godwin is not only a lewd character by his own confession, but the unblushing advocate of lewdness. As to Paine, he is well known to have been a profane swearer and a drunkard; and, we have evidence upon oath, that religion was his favorite topic when intoxicated. (See trial of Tom Paine, at Guild-

hall, for a libel, etc., p. 43.) I shall conclude the catalogue of worthies from a brief abstract of the *Confessions* of J. J. Rousseau: 'I have been a rogue, and am so still sometimes, for trifles which I would rather take than ask for.' . . He resided with Madame de Warrens, with whom he 'lived in the greatest familiarity.' This lady often suggested—just as all infidels say—'that there would be no justice in the Supreme Being, should he be strictly just to us; because, not having bestowed what was essential to make us good, it would require more than he had given.' . . . 'Finding her with all these ideas, I had occasion for to secure me from the fears of death, and its future consequences; I drew confidence and security from this source.'"—*Works of Andrew Fuller, Vol. II., pp.* 36–38*; Rousseau's Conf., London edition, Vol. I., pp.* 52, 55, 68*; Vol. II., pp.* 88, 89, 103–106.

Before our eyes is an illustration in the English scoffer, Bradlaugh, offering to take the oath in order to a seat in Parliament. The notorious infidel author and publisher of New York, Bennett, who was acknowledged by his friends a seducer, who spent a term in the penitentiary, after filling our land with infidel filth; Ingersoll, as shown up by Braden; the cry of infidelity against Comstock, for his stopping the scores of tons of obscene papers, pictures, etc., in the New York Post-office, before the mails have put them into the hands of our young people; red flag communism, etc., etc.—all these exhibitions of infidelity are open to us. From the *New York Ledger*, of May 1, 1880, I clipped the following letter: "I am an infidel and glory in my mental freedom. I pity all who are bound with the galling chain—religious superstition. I have a wife whom I once loved, but long ago that feeling left me. She is an invalid, and the doctor says she can not live more than a year. Now, there is a lady in this neighborhood whom I do love, but she is sought after by other

suitors; and I am afraid if I do not manage, in some way, to free myself pretty soon, she will be lost to me forever, and I will be rendered most miserable. As things are, two lives are made unhappy; she would be free from her intense pain and I made free. Why could I not administer to her some poison that would send her quietly off? Would I not be justified in so doing?" Let the reader carefully compare this letter from this criminal wretch with the words and lives of all classes of infidels as set forth in this chapter, and see if he is not simply acting out his principles.* Why should he not take one of Theodore Parker's falls "upward," at this time? This would be nothing in comparison with French infidelity of the eighteenth century. Its licentiousness was accompanied by cruel and the most wholesale murder on the pages of history. Thiers estimates the number that they murdered at 1,022,351, including 15,000 women; 1,135 died of child-birth, 3,400 in child-birth—from grief at the terrible picture. Read especially Thiers' Hist. French Rev., Vol. III., pp. 224–226; Allison's Hist. Europ., Vol. I., pp. 271, 272; Le Play's Org. Labor, pp. 108, 380, 381, 386, 389, 399, 400; Buckle's Hist. Civ., *et al.* Buchner, a leading infidel writer, says that the principles of infidelity found their "outward expression in the great French Revolution."—*Hist. Mat., p.* 11. See Chapter XIII., and latter part of "II." of this book.

Grecian and Roman civilization were originated and sustained by the dim extent to which its people held the ethics of the Old Testament. But Draper, an able American infidel writer, tells us that infidelity destroyed their faith in these ethics, and that then came the downfall of their civilization. See Draper's Intel. Develop. Europ., pp. 120, 126, 192; Lecky's Europ. Mor., tells us the same. The illustra-

* I do not mean to say that every infidel is "immoral" in practice; for some are exceptions, they rise above the results of their principles.

tions of infidel principles, in their writings, and in their lives, and upon the world, can be easily multiplied. But these are sufficient. They represent every age, every country, every class of infidels. Such writers as Haeckel, Vogt, Moleschott, Parker, Buckle, Voltaire, Hume, etc., etc., quoted, referred to in the foregoing, will not be called in question as fair representatives of infidelity. Well did Hume say: "Render men totally indifferent to these"—*i. e.*, moral—"distinctions; and morality is no longer a practical duty, nor has any tendency to regulate our lives and actions."—*Hume's Essays, Vol. II., p.* 218. And Haeckel admits that the infidel "theory will revolutionize politics, morals and principles of justice."—*Haeckel's Hist. Creation, Vol. II., pp.* 368, 369. This is one sentence no one can call in question. But is any moral man and good citizen ready to welcome this infidel revolution? The following may close these testimonies, as Mr. Abbott is one of the representative, rampant infidels of our country, and as it is a good summing up of the work of American infidelity: "The *Christian Intelligencer* has culled from recent publications bearing upon the influence of infidelity on the morals of a people, going to show that the religion of the Bible is the substructure upon which all true morality and good citizenship depend." Here is a significant testimony. Mr. Abbott, editor of the *Index*, one of the most unequivocal as well as the ablest of the infidel (he would call it free-religionist) journals, in retiring from the "liberal" organization, says: "For two years and a half the very worst elements in society (outside of the distinctively criminal classes) have been seizing more and more the control of organized liberal movements; and their ambition is to seize them all at last. I look about me and ask: What is to prevent their success? Nothing at all, in the present apathy of the liberals at large. Healthy organization has come to a complete stand-still; unhealthy organiz-

ations are springing up like mushrooms all over the land. To go into the work of liberal organization to-day, without the keen vigilance of which I see no sign at present, would be to play directly into the hands of a party that is an incarnate moral pestilence."

Well did the great American historian, Mr. Bancroft, who is not chargeable with an overload of "orthodoxy," say of infidelity: "Good government is not the creation of skepticism. Her garments are red with blood, and ruin is her delight; her despair may stimulate to voluptuousness and revenge; she never kindled with the disinterested love to men."—*Hist. United States, Vol. V., pp.* 22, 24. Yet infidelity is so horrified at the "horrible" ethics of the Old Testament!

We have seen, in this chapter, that the Old Testament holds out, as a basis of ethics, the moral nature of man and the need of recognizing, resisting, the *reality of sin;* and that infidelity scouts the very idea of such ethics. But, generally, the heathen, to a greater or less extent, held the immoral doctrines of infidels. Some heathen had better ideas of morals than have infidel writers. This was true of Greece and Rome, in their better days. Meander said: "A lie is better than a hurtful truth." "When telling a lie will be profitable, let it be told."—Quoted. "He may lie who knows how to do it in a suitable manner."—Quoted from Plato. "There is nothing decorous in truth, but when it is profitable; yea, sometimes truth is hurtful and lying is profitable to men."—Quoted from Maximus Tyrius. Lucretius (B. C. 95), the great father of modern infidelity, "evolution," etc., whom Tyndall so highly eulogizes, and confesses died by self-murder, which was in his forty-fourth year, composed his works "in the intervals of his madness." Like infidels of to-day, Lucretius wrote to "free man from the superstition of religion." But the following testimony of Wuttke, one of the greatest ethical writers, il-

lustrates the general position of oriental heathen nations: "The Indians, the Brahmins, and also the Buddhists, conceived morality on the basis of their consequently developed pantheism, essentially negatively. All finite reality, and, above all, that of the human personality, is null, untrue and illegitimate; either because with the Buddhists the essence of all existence is a general nullity. . . . The moral goal, the highest good, is not personal possession, but the surrender of personality to the impersonal, divine essence, or to nihility. There is no realizing and no shaping of a moral kingdom based on personality, nor even a preserving of existing reality, but a dissolving of the same."—*Eth.*, *Vol. I.*, *p.* 47.

If, then, in nothing else superior to all heathen and infidel writers, the Old Testament deserves our profoundest reverence for its ethical foundation—the moral nature of man and the recognition of the reality of sin.

5. As one of its basal facts of ethics, the Old Testament presents for the model of man's life the holiness of God.—That the moral character of individuals and of nations has invariably been like their gods is well known to every one who is familiar with history. Of this well-known fact the reader may be reminded by the worshipers of Bacchus, Moloch, Ashtaroth, Mars, Juno, Jupiter, etc., etc. Before the degraded Israelites, the Old Testament presented Jehovah as the model for their lives. On their conformity to this perfect model, the Old Testament revealed to them that all their prosperity and happiness, individually and nationally, were dependent. "Speak unto the congregation of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I am holy." Lev. xix. 2; xxi. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 2; Ps. xxii. 3; cxlv. 17; Isa. vi. 3; lii. 10; Job vi. 10, *et al.* By day and by night Israel were reminded of this holiness as their only true standard. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the

ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night."—Ps. i. 1, 2.

An essential reason for his worship is that he is holy: "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool; *for* he is holy."—Ps. xcix. 5. Reminding Israel of what they should be in all their works: "The Lord is righteous in all *his* ways, and holy in all *his* works."—Ps. cxlv. 17. The reason given to Israel for their curse: "Your *iniquities* have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hidden his face from you, that he will not hear."—Isa. xlix. 2; also, Isa. xlix. 1–15; Ezek. xxii. and xxiii; Micah vi; Hab. ii. and iii.; Zech. vii.; Mal. ii. Inasmuch as space does not here permit that these be quoted, please turn to your Bible and prayerfully read them.

The Hebrew word generally used in this connection is קָדוֹשׁ—*quadosh*. It and its family are used more than 600 times in the Old Testament to indicate moral perfection, translated in our version by such words as "holy," "separate," "sanctify," "sanctuary"—from idea of moral perfection. Gesenius, of Rationalist school, defines קָדוֹשׁ, "holy, sacred; *sanctus*—ἅγιος ἁγνος—pure, clean, free from the defilement of vice, idolatry, and other impure and profane things; opposite is חֹנֵף, impure, profane. In fixing the primitive signification of this word, the following are the classical passages: Lev. xi. 43, sq., where, after the law respecting unclean meats, it is said: 'Ye shall not pollute yourselves with these, that ye should be defiled therewith. . . . And be ye holy: for I am holy.' So Lev. xix. 2, 20, 26, where the same formula, 'be ye holy: for I am holy,' is placed at the beginning and end of a section containing various laws against fornication, adultery,

incest, idolatry, and other like crimes. . . . In a sense somewhat varied, it is applied to God as abhorring every kind of impurity, both physical and moral; as, also, the avenger of right and justice. (Ps. xxii. 4.)" There is another word, in a few instances, rendered "holy." It is חָסִיד —*chasid.* Gesenius defines it: "Kind, merciful, benevolent. Ps. xii. 2; xviii. 26; xliii. 1—Of God, kind, merciful, gracious."—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* Julius Muller says: "The expression used in the Old Testament for God's holiness—קָדוֹשׁ, קֹדֶשׁ—distinctly implies the denial of evil because it represents God as *pure* from the defilement of evil, *separated* from any communion with it. Hence, it is he whose fellowship makes man holy—יְהוָה מְקַדִּשׁוֹ. (Lev. xxi. 8, 15, 23; xxii. 9, 32.) When Jehovah appears as the terrible one, the sight of whose countenance would be death, he makes arrangements that the people be not consumed before his devouring wrath. Exod. xix. 23, 24—representations which, at first sight, seem to refer not to the moral, but to the physical manifestation of God as the almighty principle of nature; but, it must be remembered, that these manifestations of Jehovah clearly and obviously imply the guilt of the people."—*Chr. Doc. Sin., Vol. I., p.* 233. The late great American poet, Longfellow, whose memory is yet fresh in our hearts, a little while before his death, well called the following noble lines of Thackeray "a very grand sentence:" "O awful, awful Name of God! Light unbearable! Mystery unfathomable! Vastness immeasurable! O Name that God's people did fear to utter! O Light that God's prophet would have perished had he seen! Who are they who now are so familiar with it?" "It is a prominent doctrine of the Old Testament that there is in God a profound and living abhorrence of evil;

while the history of Israel is thoroughly penetrated with the consciousness that through sin the nation is guilty before God." *Idem, Ibid.* Knowing no God, infidelity knows nothing of his life as the model for ethics. The so-called ethics of infidelity leaves us like a student or workman without a model. The model of heathenism are deities partaking of the infirmities and crimes of man. "The deities were honored with rites and sacrifices of various kinds. . . . The rites used in their worship were absurd and ridiculous, and frequently cruel and obscene." "Some nations proceeded to the enormity of human sacrifices. . . . As to their prayers, they were void of piety and sense. . . . It is at least certain that this religion had not the least influence towards exciting or nourishing solid and true virtue in the minds of men. For the gods and goddesses to whom public homage was paid exhibited to their worshipers rather examples of egregious crimes than of useful and illustrious virtues. The gods, moreover, were esteemed superior to men in power and immortality; but in everything else they were considered their equals." "The divinities, generally worshiped, were rather famous for their vices than distinguished by virtuous and worthy deeds." —*Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., Part I., sec.* 10–13; *Wuttke's Eth., Vol. II., pp.* 85, 86. And Julius Muller sums up history: "It is allowed, on all sides, that the specific difference between the religion of the Bible and heathenism is the high moral standard which the former maintains in contemplating the relation between God and man, and the prominence it gives to God's holiness. The divine revelations contained in Genesis and Exodus begin deeply to impress the thought of God's holiness upon the heart of man; and in the fullness of their realization in Jesus Christ, this idea shines forth in the perfection of its clearness. God is absolutely 'the good'—ὁ ἀγαθός." —*Chr. Doc. Sin., Vol. I., p.* 233. Both the Old and the New

Testament, as the completion of ethics in man, present him exactly like his Model in holiness. Not simply to save man from punishment is the object of Old and New Testament redemption, but to save him also from *sin*. This object is summarized in: "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be *like* him." —John iii. 2. "As for me, I will behold thy face in *righteousness:* I shall be *satisfied* when I awake with thy *likeness.*" —Ps. xvii. 15. The true Christian could not be satisfied with a salvation that saved from punishment without saving from sin. Nothing less than a spotless and perfect moral—sinless —character and life could satisfy any one in whom regeneration has awakened the hungering and the thirsting "after righteousness."

Nowhere in heathen ages or in infidelity does the true end of life appear. Here it glows and sparkles as the sun. No better than other heathenism is the lauded Vedas—lauded by infidels. Says Prof. Whitney: "The attainment of wealth and power is aimed at, the downfall of enemies, the removal of petty pests, and so on, even down to the growth of hair and bald pates."—*Orient. Ling. Studies, Vol. I., p.* 21. Of the people of the Vedas: "The object for which such a people strive is booty. It is with no evil conscience that they wage this predatory warfare; they ask of their gods success in it with the utmost simplicity and good faith; their prayers are, ever, not for their peaceful preservation and increase only of their present possessions, but that they may be enriched with the spoils of their enemies. Their names for the combat, the similes they derive from it, the whole strain in which it is mentioned in their hymns, witness to the thorough zest and spirit in which they fought."—*Idem, pp.* 26, etc., 42, 50, 52, 219; also, *Comp. Hist. Relig.*, by Moffat, *Vol. I., pp.* 193, 194. Prof. W. Robertson Smith, who can not be charged with

"orthodoxy," says: "The true distinction of Israel's religion lies in the character of the Deity who made himself personally known to his people, and demands of them a life conformed to his spiritual character as a righteous and forgiving God."—*The Old Test. in Jewish Church, p.* 56, of "*Seaside Lib.*" *Ed.*

From the preceding investigation, we are led to the conclusion that God, as a God of holiness for the *model* of Old Testament life, presents Old Testament Ethics as incomparably pure and spotless and, beyond all possible calculation, elevating to individuals and nations.

6. As a basis to ethics the Old Testament teaches the doctrine of future rewards and punishments.—As to the influence of this doctrine on individual and national life, it is so obvious that infidels readily concede that it is of incalculable help to both. The following are but a few of the many infidel concessions. Montesquieu says: "The idea of a place of future rewards and punishments necessarily imports that there is a place of future rewards and punishments, and that where the people hope for the one without fear of the other civil laws have no force."—*Spirit of Laws.* Bolingbroke, the chief English infidel of the seventeenth century, says: "The doctrine of future rewards and punishments has a great tendency to enforce civil laws and restrain the vices of men."—*Shedd's Hist. Chr. Doc., Vol. I., p.* 200. Hume, in whom English Deism reached its climax, said: "Disbelief in futurity lessens, in a great measure, the ties of morality, and may be supposed, for that reason, to be pernicious to civil society."—*Bates' Ency. Ill., p.* 483; *Hume's Essays, Vol. II., p.* 143. Alluding to these doctrines, Dr. Draper says: "From these considerations there arises an inducement to live a virtuous life."—*Intellectual Develop. of Europe, p.* 539. Buckle says: "The question whether he may or may not

commit a crime depends . . . upon the fear of the law, a dread of penalties held out by religion."—*Hist. Civ. in Eng.*, *Vol. I.*, *p.* 18. Lecky says: "If men introduce the notion of infinite punishments and infinite rewards distributed by an omniscient Judge, they can undoubtedly supply stronger reasons for practicing virtue than can be found for practicing vice."—*Hist. Europ. Mor. Vol. I.*, *pp.* 15, 122. In the same connection, Lecky says: "In the first place, a well-ordered system of threats and punishments marks out the path of virtue with a distinctness of definition it could scarcely have otherwise attained. In the next place, it often happens that when the mind is swayed by a conflict of motives the expectation of rewards and punishments will so reinforce or support the virtuous motives as to secure the victory."

Of course, infidel ethics has nothing of the kind. It seeks to kick these great pillars from under ethics. Hence, Benjamin Franklin, in advising Tom Paine not to publish his "Age of Reason," wrote: "Think how great a portion of men and women . . . who have need of the motives of religion to restrain them from vice. . . . I would advise you, therefore, not to attempt unchaining the tiger, but to burn this piece before it is seen by another person. . . . If men are so wicked with religion, what would they be without it."—*Life and Writings of Franklin, Vol. X.*, *pp.* 282, 283.

What a pity for American morals—and his own, too—that Paine did not take Franklin's advice and burn his poisonous work, and not "unchain the tiger" of immorality and passion! But, as if the tiger was not sufficiently unchained and the life sufficiently poisoned, others continue Paine's work.

Would that they would act as wisely as Voltaire did: "One day D'Alembert and Condorcet, when dining with Voltaire, proposed to converse on Atheism; but he stopped them at once. 'Wait,' said he, 'till my servants have withdrawn; I

do not wish to have my throat cut to-night.'"—*Ency. Ill., by Bates, p.* 483.

Only such as the frivolous Epicureans, and but few of them, have ever denied that the doctrine of future rewards and punishments is essential to morals.—*Hume's Essays, Vol. II., p.* 143. They said: "Anxious concern as to a future retribution and a divine world-government are the greatest folly; our thinking and striving should regard only this life."—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 128. Such are the sentiments of Ingersoll, Underwood, etc. These Epicureans contributed a large share of the influences that destroyed the civilization of their age. So the modern Epicureans are doing. Hence, Communism, etc.

Theodore Parker expressed the philosophy of life when he said: "If to-morrow I perish utterly, then my fathers will be to me only as the ground out of which my bread-corn is grown. I shall care nothing for the generation of mankind. I shall know no higher law than passion. Morality will vanish."—*Scr. 7 on Theism, quoted in Alger's Future Life, p.* 655.

Against the infidel position—of no future—Paul wrote: "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die. Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good morals."—1 Cor. xv. 32, 33.

Future rewards and punishments encourage in despondency, terrify the obstinate, and, by their being the measure and expression of the merit and demerit of our actions, teach the exceeding righteousness of the law and our responsibility. Only upon the merit and demerit of our actions can they be meted out; and, they must adequately express the *extent* of the merit and demerit of these actions.

Infidels must hold to their denial of future rewards and punishments, or give up every infidel doctrine. Denying the Lawgiver, Moral Governor, the Moral Law, the moral re-

sponsibility of man, that there is *real* sin and guilt, they consistently deny future rewards and punishments. But their doctrine must be applied to punishment for sin here. For, if there is no sin, no guilt, the laws of society and country have no more right to punish the outlaw than to punish the good man. The most they can do is to confine the outlaw, in order to keep him from injuring any one or anything. Hence, we find skeptics naturally opposed to capital and other severe punishments—all punishments, really. So infidel morals are subversive of all morality and civilization.

The Old Testament teaches the doctrine of future rewards and punishments in, *a*, the atonement. If no future, why did Christ die to save from the eternal sin and its punishment? *b*. In the promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham. This He had never given him; "no, not so much as to set his foot upon." Read and compare Gen xv. 7, 8 with Acts vii. 5. *c*. The doctrine was shown to Moses. Read Luke xx. 37. *d*. The promise of the everlasting establishment of the throne of David. This is to be fulfilled in the reign of the "Son of David," after the resurrection. Read 2 Sam. vii. 11, 16; xxiii. 3, 5, compared with Acts ii. 25–36; xv. 15, 16. *e*. In the translation of Elijah. Read 2 Kings ii. 11. *f*. David's consolation on the death of his child. Read 2 Sam. xii. 18–23—especially v. 23. *g*. In many other ways the doctrine of future rewards and punishment appears in the Old Testament. Read Job xix. 26, 27; xxi. 14–30; Prov. xiv. 32; x. 28; Ps. ix. 17; xxxvii. 37,38; Ezek. xxxiii. 8, 9; Mal. iv. 1; Dan. xii. 2, 3. The Old Testament Scriptures teaching the doctrine of future rewards and punishments are too numerous to here refer to. Let the reader read especially the eleventh chapter of Hebrews for the faith of Old Testament saints in the future.

7. OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS IS BASED ON HUMILITY.—The

Hebrew words עָנָה—*anah*, שָׁפַל—*shaphel*, רפס—*raphas*, דָּכָא—*daka* שָׁחַח—*shachah*, צָנַע—*tsana*, and their family, signify "to humble one's self, to submit;" "to be afflicted, oppressed, humbled," and in the Hith. to "humble oneself, to submit oneself;" "oppressed, afflicted, wretched, but everywhere with the accessory idea of humility, meekness; *i. e.*, the humble, the meek, who prefer to suffer wrong rather than to do wrong (Ps. xxv. 9; xxxvii. 11; lxix. 33), and who, therefore, enjoy God's favor (Ps. x. 17; xxii. 27; xxxiv. 3; cxlvii. 6; Isa. xxix. 19,) *et. al.*"—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* They occur more than one hundred and fifty times. They are rendered in our version by such words as "gentleness," "humble," "humility," "meek," "meekness," "afflict," "afflicted." These words, first, point to God's holiness and to our unholiness; second, to the certainty of the punishment of sin; third, to the deservedness of this punishment; fourth, to our repenting ourselves from sin; fifth, to our submitting to the moral government of God; sixth, to the finite nature of man before the infinite God; seventh, to our dependence upon God as our Ruler and Preserver; eighth, to the gentleness of character which can but result from such a disposition. Thus, humility is that virtue of turning from wrong to right; not thinking more highly of ourselves than we ought to think; and of purity and gentleness of character. This quality of mind is opposed to pride, haughtiness, vain presumption and rebellion against the moral law.* Humility is peculiar to the Old and the New Testament Ethics.

Denying that sin exists is but the denial of every virtue that is caused by realizing and turning from sin; yea, more, denying that sin exists is cultivating every wicked inclination.

*One of the most prevalent sins of our times, and one which is essential to infidelity, is pride in "intellectual powers."

Hume, under the irresistible light of the Bible, faintly perceived what humility is when he said: "Pride is a certain satisfaction in ourselves. . . . Humility, on the other hand, is a dissatisfaction with ourselves on account of some defect or infirmity."—*Hume's Essays, Vol. II., p.* 183. I say "a faint idea;" for Hume's ideas of morals did not permit him to see that this "defect or infirmity is sin"—the ruin of the soul.

Infidels can have only a faint idea of humility; and that idea is humility in only a part of its secondary meaning. Hence, we hear and read so much from infidels on "be yourself;" "throw off superstition" (meaning the Bible authority); "you need no Bible, reason alone is sufficient;" "we have outgrown religion;" "we are good enough without an atonement;" "be too much of a man to humble yourself for mercy," etc., etc.

"While the fundamental feeling of the heathen virtue-sage is that profound self-consciousness of personal merit (like infidels), the fundamental feeling of the Christian is the feeling of grace—accepting, thankful, loving humility."— *Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 175.

Lecky says: "The disposition of humility was pre-eminently a Christian virtue. . . . It is scarcely possible for a nature to be pervaded by a deep sentiment of humility without this exercising a softening influence over the whole character. To transform a fierce, warlike nature into a gentler type, the first essential is to awaken this feeling."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., pp.* 197, 198.

Because of the absence or presence of this virtue, as the case may be, admitted a virtue by Lecky, "the first essential to transform us into a gentler type"—the Old and the New Testament thunder the curse of a holy law upon the proud, and pour the oil of consolation, peace and joy into the hearts

of the humble. "He shall save the humble person."—Job xxii. 29. "He forgetteth not the cry of the humble."—Ps. ix. 12. "Lord, thou hast heard the cry of the humble."—Ps. x. 17. "The humble shall hear thereof and be glad."—Ps. xxxiv. 2. "The humble shall see this and be glad: and your heart shall live that seek God."—Ps. lxix. 32. "Better is it to be of an humble spirit with the lowly than to divide the spoil with the strong."—Prov. xvi. 19. "A man's pride shall bring him low: but honor shall uphold the humble in spirit."—Prov. xxix. 23. Those who are haughty—proud, we dislike. They can not learn the deeper lessons of life—of the soul. No really proud man was ever at the throne of God's mercy—at the foot of his cross; at the table of his blessings. This is one of the secrets of so many poor sinners making "shipwreck of their souls" upon the shoals of infidelity. To them the Bible is a dark thing, and Christ "a root out of dry ground, a rock of offense." To them preaching is "foolishness;" while a caricature upon the Holy Book is "a rich thing." The man who never studied the Bible a week can, by the help of pride, as *dogmatically* pronounce it false as the Pope ever pronounced a superstition true. Jesus invites only those who can learn. "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. . . . *Learn* of me."—Matt. xi. 28, 29. "The fear of the Lord is the instruction of wisdom; and before honor is humility."—Prov. xv. 33; Prov. xxii. 4. "Seek ye the Lord, all ye *meek* of the earth."—Zeph. ii. 3. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is *Holy;* I dwell in the high and holy place, *with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit.*"—Isa. lvii. 15. Would that the doubting reader, like doubting Thomas, would find rest from the stormy and shoreless ocean of doubt by letting these sweet calls of mercy come home to his heart! We may, then, conclude this point

by stating that, in making humility an essential to ethics, the Old Testament presents the highest ethics.

8. THE OLD TESTAMENT PRESENTS REPENTANCE FROM SIN AS A BASIS TO ETHICS.

From Old Testament Ethics, in the Moral Law Maker, government, Governor and Judge; in man's being responsible to these; in his being a sinner, comes the duty and necessity of repentance. In the fifty-first Psalm the reader has the Old Testament doctrine of repentance. He will there see that it consists of, first, deep sorrow and pain for sin; "the bones which thou hast broken"—an expression denoting deep pain and sorrow. Second. That it consists of a true sense of the heinousness of sin. "For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my *sin* is ever before me." By day and by night the true penitent is troubled with the fearful sight of his *sin*. His heart with grief bursts out in its confession.. Third. God's awful nature of *holiness* is by the Spirit so impressed upon the sinner that he is brought to the true sense of sin, and attributes his trouble to this awakening—"the bones which *thou* hast broken." Fourth. True repentance is towards God. As rebellion against law is in reality rebellion against its maker and authority; inasmuch as God is the Lawgiver and Authority of the moral law, all sin—rebellion—is against him. We may trespass on each other's rights; but, strictly speaking, we can sin against only God. "Against thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." The New simply reiterates the Old in preaching "repentance towards *God*." (Acts xx. 21.) The Hebrew word for repent is נָחַם—*nacham*. It means "to pant, to sigh, to groan, to lament, to grieve. . . . In regard to one's own doings, to grieve; hence, to repent. Often one who repents grieves for the evil he has brought upon another."—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* See illustrations of its use in Job xlii. 1–6; Jer. viii. 6; xxxi. 19. Of course, the other uses of the word belong to

another subject. There is another word rendered repent, שׁוּב—*shubh;* but that more properly means to "turn back, return."—*Ges. Lex. Heb.; Harper's Heb. Vocab., p.* 14; Fuerst, Young, etc. It occurs in more than one hundred places in the Old Testament, as rendered by our version "turn," though, generally, with the implied idea of repentance. Julius Muller says: "Repentance is not only a passive feeling, but an inward act; not a mere verdict of conscience, but an act of the will. It differs from the bare consciousness of guilt by a free surrender to this inward punishment. Repentance is an element in the work of salvation, a step in the way back to God."—*Chr. Doc. Sin., Vol. I., p.* 213. See Ps. 51. Shakespeare says:

"O wretched state! O Bosom black as Death!
O limed soul, that, struggling to be *free*,
Art more engaged! Help, angels make assay!
Bow, stubborn knees! and heart, with strings of steel,
Be soft as sinews of the *new-born babe*.
For Heaven doth know, so shall the world perceive,
That I have turned away my *former self;*
So will I those that kept me company."

The necessity to ethics of such a change he well expresses:

"Many sorrows:
Conscious Remorse and Anguish must be felt,
To curb Desire; to break the stubborn Will;
And work a *second nature* in the Soul,
Ere Virtue can resume the place she lost."

Knowing nothing of moral government, of morality, of moral responsibility, etc., of the reality of sin, infidelity can know nothing of repentance from sin. Believing, as Theodore Parker, that "every fall is a fall upward," that "sin can not make an indelible mark on the soul;" and, as Moles-

schott says, that "to comprehend everything involves also the justifying of everything" (the reader please here turn back to "4" of this chapter, p. 31), infidelity can, if it knows any kind of repentance, know only the repentance because the cup of sin may not be full.

With a few heathen, there may have been a dim knowledge of repentance. But, as Harless says: "We can by no means assert that the pre-Christian world had, by virtue of conscience, a just and universal perception that their whole condition was blamable."—*Sys. Chr. Eth.*, *p.* 75.

"We find not the least trace of the natural corruption of mankind; there is admitted, as was the case in Aristotle's system, simply a difference between the rude multitude, little inclined to, and little capable of, the good, and the more happily gifted ones—the latter being, of course, the Stoics themselves; and it is given as an essential characteristic of a sage, never to repent of anything. . . . Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius" . . . . prayed, but "there is no trace of penitential prayer; but, for the most part, only the spirit of the Pharisee's prayer. . . . It is, in fact, not impossible that in the more religious tendency of later Stoicism, there is a degree of influence from Christianity."—*Wuttke's Eth.*, *Vol. I.*, *p.* 136.

Lecky, an infidel, says: "Repentance for past sin has absolutely no place, nor do the ancients appear to have ever realized the purifying and spiritualizing influence of it upon the character."—*Hist. Europ. Mor.*, *Vol. I.*, *p.* 205. We must, therefore, conclude that in making repentance an essential basis of ethics, the Old Testament is of incomparable purity.

9. Regeneration is a foundation of Old Testament Ethics.—The great German poet, Goethe, when about eighty years old, confessed that he could not remember being happy,

even for a few weeks together; and that when he wished to feel comfortable, he had to vail his self-consciousness. The following is the closing sentence of his biography: "Child!! child! no more. The course of time, lashed, as it were, by invisible spirits, hurries on the light car of our destiny; and all that we can do is, in cool self-possession, to hold the reins with a firm hand, and to guide the wheels, now to the left, now to the right; a stone here, a precipice there. Whither are we hurrying; who can tell? And who can indeed remember the point from which we started?"

In his oration on his brother's death, Robert Ingersoll uttered the sad wail: "Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our wailing." "No matter if its (life) every hour is rich with love, and every moment jeweled with a joy, it will, at its close, become a tragedy as sad, and deep, and dark, as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death." "A wreck must mark, at last, the end of each and every life."

The cultivated pen of poor Byron, a skeptic, never sketched anything in truer colors than he did the depravity of the human heart. In this sketch is the explanation of the bitter wail and despair of life, as Ingersoll and others have uttered it. He says:

> "Our life is a false nature; 'tis not in
> The harmony of things, this hard decree,
> This uneradicable taint of sin,
> This boundless Upas, this all-blasting tree
> Whose roots is earth, whose leaves and branches be
> The skies which rain their plagues on me like dew,
> Disease, death, bondage; all the woes we see,
> And worse, the woes we see not, which thrill through
> The immedicable soul with heart-aches ever new."

Or as Byron paints our sinful lives:

> "My days are as the yellow-leaf;
> The flower, the fruit of love are gone,
> The worm, the canker and the grief are mine alone."

For the lone, morally shipwrecked soul, on life's ocean, thus lifting its moans and wails above the storm, infidelity and heathenism have no rescue. "The philosopher could, like Cicero, bear testimony to the universal depravity which surrounded man from his youth up (Tuscul. iii. 1), but philosophy was incapable of arresting the ever-increasing stream of licentiousness. Philosophy was obliged to confess that we, while our spirit is sick, pronounce judgment upon ourselves (*'animus de se ipse tum judicat, quum id ipsum, quo judicator, ægrotet'*); but just as strongly, at the same time, that the medicine which she offered found no acceptance (*'animi medicina nec tam desiderata, antequam inventa, nec tam culta, posteaquam cognita, nec tam multis grata et probata, pluribus etiam suspecta et invisa.'—Tus. iii.* 1) that the philosophers did not even apply to themselves. . . . The effect of the whole Grecian philosophy was to weaken the conscience, owing to its ignorance of the source and magnitude of the evil, owing to its delusion concerning the means of eradicating it."—*Sys. Chr. Eth., by Harless, pp.* 94, 95.

Wuttke says that Aristotle, in whom Grecian and heathen ethics attained their highest perfection, "renounced all hope of radically bettering the unreceptive multitude. . . . He contented himself with keeping them in check."—*Eth., Vol. I., p.* 114.

Lecky says: "Philosophy was altogether impotent to regenerate mankind. . . . There is a remarkable passage in Celsus on the impossibility (Celsus was an infidel) of restoring a nature once thoroughly depraved."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 4.

In this condition, the heathen world was ready to snatch at anything that seemed to offer deliverance or relief. To this is due, as Prof. Moffat says, "The power of Buddhism, whereby it took hold on the vast population, was the promise it held forth of deliverance from all the ills of human life. . . . A negative religion, it sought its end, not by doing good, but by shunning the risk of suffering"—by annihilation or becoming nothing.—*Comp. Hist. Relig., by Moffat, Part I., p.* 215.

But the very design of the Old Testament is to regenerate and rescue men from this terrible moral shipwreck and night of despair. Not by offering annihilation, as does Buddhism; not by rendering man unfeeling as a stone, as does Stoicism, does the Old Testament propose the rescue. Recognizing sin, sinful pollution, the galling chain and the darkness of *sin* as man's woe, the Old Testament comes with the only hope and rescue: "A new heart will I also give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes."—Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27. "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me."—Ps. li. 10. Old Testament Ethics makes the tree good that the fruit may be good. Therefore it says: "Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes) representing the All-searching Eye of the Holy One looking upon sin in order to judge); cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." Then as encouragement: "Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."—Isa. i. 16–18. Thus changed, every motive to virtue finds obedient response

within the bosom. Of this change, as effected by Christianity, and, as we see, in Old Testament Ethics, Lecky, an able infidel, writes: "The transformation of such a nature, which was continually effected by Christianity, was confessedly beyond the power of philosophy."—*Hist. Europ. Mor. Vol. II.*, *p.* 4. We may, therefore, say that Old Testament Ethics brings light into darkened hearts; for moral pollution gives moral purity; for despair gives hope; for moral slavery, moral freedom; for heavy, gloomy hearts, light and happy hearts; for separation and exile from the Father's house, a washed, best-robed prodigal, with the "ring on his finger," again at the Father's table, eating the "fatted calf," drinking in the Father's love.

10. THE OLD TESTAMENT PRESENTS FAITH AS FUNDAMENTAL TO ETHICS.—The Hebrew for believe is אָמַן—*aman*. It means "to prop, to stay, to support," as "to bear or carry a child;" "to stay oneself, to be stayed up, supported; hence, to be firm, stable, such as one may safely lean upon, metaphorically, to be faithful."—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* In twenty-eight instances it is rendered "faithful;" in forty-five, "believe;" in eighteen, "faithfulness;" in two, "faith;" and in two, "steadfast." In this use of the word—and its family—we have indicated moral character. See Num. xii. 7; Deut. vii. 9; 1 Sam. ii. 35; Neh. ix. 8; xiii. 13; Ps. lxxxix. 37; ci. 6; Prov. xi. 13; Isa. i. 21; viii. 2; Jer. xlii. 5; Prov. xxviii. 20, where we have it rendered "faithful." See Gen. xv. 6; Num. xx. 12; Ps. xxvii. 13; cvi. 12; cvi. 24; Isa. liii. 1. "And he said, I will hide my face from them, I will see what their end shall be: for they are a very froward generation, children in whom is no (אֱמוּן—*emun*—literally, faithfulness) faith."—Deut. xxxii. 20. The adjectives "steadfast," "faithful," etc., being from the verb which means "to stay," "to

prop," "to support," evidently point to that quality of *character* in man which entitles him to be regarded as morally reliable. "Faith is designated in Scripture by the same expression with fidelity, is the loving response to God's fidelity to us, and an expression of our fidelity toward the faithful God, is a high moral acquirement. . . . All humility rests on faith, and is also obedience." "Trusting in God (that is, in all his commands, requirements, leadings, promises—his glorious character) is faith, love and hope at the same time; . . . it is simply the germ of that threefold life that is antecedent to all actual moral life. . . . Only the absolutely good—the divine, is free from all doubt."—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. II., pp.* 298, 174. "Hence, the moral *awe* of God—the true *reverence* for God, is the beginning of all wisdom and the condition of all morality. (Deut. v. 29; vi. 2; x. 20; Prov. i. 7; viii. 13; ix. 10; xv. 33; xvi. 6; Ps. cxi. 10; cxii. 7; Job xxviii. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 1.) Only those who fear the Lord trust in the Lord (Ps. cxv. 11); for only the holy God gives surety for his love and truthfulness; not to fear God involves being godless (Prov. i. 29; Rom. iii. 18); and piety is synonymous with the fear of God. (Acts ix. 13; Eph. v. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 1.) The reference is not to this pious dread of the holy God, but to that mere servile fear which is at bottom hatred, when St. John says: 'There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear.' . . . (1 John iv. 18.) The true fear of God is closely allied to the love of God."—*Eth., Vol. II., p.* 173.

Inasmuch as the relation of faith to ethics is so important, so little understood, so much assailed by skeptics, and, as it is fundamental to Old Testament Ethics—the New, too—though it is a little diffuse in style, I will here insert my sermon on the subject.

WHY DAMNED FOR NOT BELIEVING.

"An evil heart of unbelief." "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved; but he that *believeth* not shall be damned."—Heb. iii. 12; Mark xvi. 16.

In as little time as possible, I will show why our eternal destiny is dependent on belief. I propose to show you that belief is a matter of moral or spiritual *character.*

I. The original words for belief and unbelief designate character.

First. Let us notice the words, in the Greek New Testament, for believe, belief. There is one word in the Greek for faith. It is *pistis.* It is a noun, derived from the verb *pistuo. Pistis* occurs two hundred and forty-two times in the New Testament. Our version renders it "faith" in every one of these occurrences save three. One of these three it renders "assurance" (Acts xvii. 31); another, "belief" (2 Thess. ii. 13); and the other, by "fidelity" (Titus ii. 10). For uniformity, principle and clearness, it should have rendered it faith in these three times.

Pistuo occurs two hundred and forty-three times. It is rendered "believe," or "believest," or "believeth," in nearly every one of these occurrences. In the exceptions the same idea is contained. Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17—rendered "committed," meaning intrusted, believed; also, Gal. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 11; Titus i. 3. In *pistuo* and its noun being used four hundred and eighty-five times in the New Testament is conclusive evidence of its having a prominent and clear moral meaning; for the New Testament is a book on sin and holiness It is true that there are two other words in our version —*pitho* and *elpis*—rendered faith; but the former means persuaded and the latter hope; so the adjective from *pistis* is, in a few cases, made a verb by rendering it "believe." (1 Tim. iv. 10.) (This, of course, is a blunder in rendering.) Liddell

and Scott's Lexicon, the standard of America and of England, thus defines *pistuo*—the word rendered believe: "To believe, trust, trust in, put faith in, rely on a person or thing; as, believe my words, to believe mutually, to believe that, feel sure, confident that a thing is true, entrusted."

In different words Greenfield and Robinson, in their Lexicons, likewise define the word. They, therefore, define *pistis* —the noun—"generally persuasion of a thing, confidence, assurance, credit, trust, pledge, treaty, warrant." From classic Greek Liddell and Scott's Lexicon quotes *pistis* as being used in making a "treaty by exchange of *assurances* and oaths, to give assurances, to receive into friendship, *an assurance.* A means of persuasion, an argument, proof (Plat. Phæd. 70 B., Isoc. 28 B.); especially, of a moral nature, opposite to a demonstrative proof" (Arist. Rhet. 1, 1, 11).

Looking over these uses of the word in classic Greek, we see that it denotes the sacred tie of *trust* in men by which contracts, treaties, bosom friends were made, and the relations of friends, family and states—everything—sustained. We have seen that the words in the Hebrew for faith are used in the same way. As our relations to each other are moral, faith, upon which these relations are based, is a moral act of the soul. We, therefore, find the Greeks making of this word an adjective—*pistos*—to designate the worthiness or unworthiness of men. So *pistos* is defined by Liddell and Scott—all Lexicons too—"faithful, trusty, good-faith, thought trusty, trustworthy, to be trusty, credible, in a trustworthy manner" So *pistees*, defined "honesty," belongs to the same family of words. No one can fail to perceive that this whole family of words designate *moral character*, unless he is prepared to deny that it is a sin to not trust each other and to be unworthy of trust—"dishonest" ourselves, and holding all others to be the same.

More force is thrown upon these words by the words for unbelief.

In the New Testament there are five words for unbelief. These are *apithia*, *apisteo*, *apistia*, *apistos*, *apitheo*. These five words are found sixty-five times in the New Testament. *Apisteo*, *apistia*, *apistos*, are of the same family. They are of the family of *pistuo;* but are negatives, meaning unbelief and disbelief. The other two words—rather one—are, "not persuaded," or rather unpersuaded, and thus mean unbelief and disbelief, rather by implication. We will, therefore, notice only *apisteo*, *apistia*, *apistos;* confining ourselves to the family of words that properly and primarily relate to belief. As the words are etymologically negatives to the others, they are rightly defined by Lexicons to mean, not to believe, to disbelieve; *e. g.*, persons testifying, testimony, or the like, to be unfaithful, unbelief, disbelief, unfaithfulness, unbelieving, disbelieving, passive, not be believed or trusted. They also mean faithlessness and treachery. (Liddell and Scott's, Boise's Lexicon of Xenophon; Robinson and Greenfield's Lexicons.) "The words are sometimes, therefore, used to signify disobedience to law or rule," say Liddell and Scott's, and other Lexicons. They have taken that use, *because a faithless, distrustful person has the prime elements of lawlessness.*

Many Greek words by their adoption into New Testament use, have been made technically Christian.—*Winers' N. T. Gram., p.* 35. The New Testament adoption of these Greek words for faith, faithful, faithfulness; unbelief, disbelief, unfaithful, faithlessness, has confined them exclusively to morals and given their moral use more than double force. These words, which designate our trust and distrust in each other; our faithfulness and unfaithfulness, our trustworthiness and untrustworthiness—the very essence of our character, the very life, foundation and perpetuity of every institution of society,

or its disintegration and ruin, are the words that are used in the New Testament to designate our relation to God, the Preserver and moral Ruler, and to his word and law. Thus we are said to believe or disbelieve God and his word; to be faithful or unfaithful to our relations to him; to be trustworthy or untrustworthy. A soul believes God when it believes in the purity and holiness of his law, the faithfulness of God to his promises, and the certainty of the just sentence upon all the disobedient. A soul is therefore regarded as faithful which believes in God—trying to live out that belief, and unfaithful when it does not; as worthy when it believes and unworthy when it does not believe. "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God."—James ii. 23. "The unbelieving shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."—Rev. xxi. 8. "He that believeth and is baptized"—believes and shows his belief by his acting—"shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Nothing is clearer than that unbelief in or towards any good person, good government—faithlessness to any obligation—untrustworthiness—is a condition of heart, a quality of character. Applied to our relation to God, it is immeasurably more so. Hence, our text declares that the heart of unbelief in or towards God is an "*evil* heart of unbelief;" and that whosoever believes not, "has an evil heart," a bad character in the sight of the infinitely just and holy God—"shall be damned." The words for belief and unbelief are, therefore, words that point to the moral condition of heart and the quality of character that constitute us good or bad, whether here or hereafter; that constitute our acceptance or rejection of good here or hereafter; our weal or our woe at the judgment and in eternity. How solemnly should these words, belief and unbe-

lief, ring in our ears; how deep should they sink into our hearts!

Reason, principle and experience prove that belief or unbelief depends upon the moral condition of the heart.

By the word heart, as used in religion and morals, theologians, the Bible and metaphysicians mean the fountain and seat of our moral nature, McCosh says: "Take the distinction drawn, in some form by most civilized languages, between the head and heart. The distinction embodies a great truth. Under the phrase 'heart' in particular are covered powers with wide diversities of function, such as the conscience, the emotions, the will."—*Intuitions of the Mind, p.* 60.

1. Belief in any fact or truth depends upon a fair examination of the evidence supporting it. Evidence is indispensable to any right belief. But evidence is effectual only when fairly weighed. There can, therefore, be no true belief in the absence of a fair examination of evidence.

2. A fair examination of the evidences of Christianity is prevented by prejudice. The word "prejudice" is from the Latin *pre*—before, and *judicium*—judgment. It, therefore, means a judgment formed before due examination. Thus, thousands upon thousands who have never read their Bible through, who have never thought sufficiently upon Christianity to be able to tell what it is, have decided it false. Tom Paine could write the first part of his "Age of Reason" with no Bible in the house. Knowing nothing of Jesus, the Jews decided he could not be the Messiah, because they thought no good could come out of Nazareth. Because some men are mean who profess religion, many decide that all are so; and that religion is, therefore, a falsehood and a delusion.

Because some women are impure, the black in heart believe all are impure. Such persons treat evidence as the seamen who had been sailing several days, almost dying for fresh

water, when sailing on fresh water. They are soured on all things good. To them all things good are only traps and delusions, to catch the unwary; and he who is not filled with the miasma of the marshes of skepticism is filled with foolishness and "superstition." To say that to such persons, good in religion, or in anything else, is hidden and sealed, is needless. To say that to the impure all things are impure, is more than needless. Christianity says: "Come and *see; look* and live." Christianity demands belief, because it is true. It demands a fair examination. It curses for unbelief, because only the impure will refuse to examine a good thing. It curses for unbelief, because it curses the man whose heart is so soured against all good that he brands everything good with the words "delusion," "falsehoods," "superstition," and refuses to come and see, look and live. If our courts forbid a man from judging as judge or juryman who is prejudiced, how much more shall Christianity forbid any man from judging it when prejudiced against it? If our courts forbid the prejudiced from tarnishing the character of any man —from punishing any man as prejudiced jurymen and judges, how much more shall Christianity hurl its thunderbolts of judicial wrath upon the head of him who brands its spotless character with "falsehood," "delusion," and "superstition?" For what is unbelief in Christianity but a *belief* that it is but a "falsehood," a system of "priestcraft," a "delusion" and "superstition?" And what is this but the judgment of prejudiced judges who can not tell what it is; who, in most cases, have thus branded it upon the hearing or reading of burlesques or caricatures upon it and tirades against it by those who brand it as the libertine brands all female virtue?

As you indignantly and spontaneously invoke justice upon the libertine who brands your wife or daughter as impure because he knows only impure women, Christianity indignantly

and spontaneously pronounces upon him who dares brand it a "falsehood" and "superstition," because he knows nothing better and will not look at anything better when presented to him; I say, Christianity pronounces upon him the curse of a holy law, "Whosoever believes not shall be damned."

3. Pride, haughtiness of heart, prevents a fair examination of Christianity. The man who is too proud to acknowledge that there is a Being higher than himself, who made him, who rules him, who judges him, who preserves him; he who, as the outlaw, knows no power above himself; he who scorns the fact of law and lawgiver ruling him, punishing and rewarding him; he who scorns to bow at the shrine of the great I Am because he knows no worship but his own worship—such a man has no heart to examine the worship of any being outside of himself; such a man casts the evidences of Christianity from him with demoniacal scorn. If he ever inquires where Jesus is to be found, it is only as cruel Herod, to resist him, to destroy him. If Christianity seemed to promise him independence of rule, of law, of judgment, liberty to be a "freethinker"—to think free of all law and responsibility, if it promised, as the devil promised, that the forbidden fruit of self-rule, self-worship, would exalt him—"Ye shall be as gods" —no doubt he would readily examine its evidences. Alluding to the words of our Savior, Bishop Wilson wrote: "Christianity inscribes on the portal of her dominion, 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter therein.' Christianity does not profess to convince the perverse and head-strong; to bring irresistible evidence to the daring and profane; to vanquish the proud scorner and afford evidence from which the careless and perverse can not possibly escape. This might go to destroy man's responsibility. All that Christianity professes is to propose such evidences as may satisfy the meek, the tractable, the candid, the

serious inquirer."—*Bishop Wilson's Evidences, p.* 38. Says Lord Bacon: "There is no other entrance to the kingdom of man, which is founded in the sciences, than to the kingdom of heaven, into which no one can enter but in the character of a little child."—*Nov. Org.*, 1, 68. And the late Prof. Greenleaf, late Dean and Professor of Law in Harvard University, author of a "Treatise on the Law of Evidence"—a standard to the legal profession—says: "Christianity must be examined by a mind free from all pride of opinion."—*Test. of the Evangelists, by Simon Greenleaf, p.* 1. The man who feels that he would "rather go to hell than believe in Christianity;" who decries all worship, but that of himself, as "blind, servile ignorance;" who says that all true liberty is freedom from the restraint of divine law, is hurled by the great Judge into the marshes of skepticism and disbelief, to drink its sickening, poisoning, stagnant waters, to breathe its miasma, to wander in its fog, to wallow in its mire, to lie down among the slimy, hideous serpents of tormenting doubt and curse the day of his birth; while ten thousand thunders roll their voices from the great white throne of justice: "Whosoever believeth not shall be damned."

"The haughty feet of power shall fail
Where meekness surely goes;
No cunning finds the key of heaven,
No strength its gates unclose.

"Alone to guilelessness and love
Those gates shall open fall:
The mind of pride is nothingness,
The child-like heart is all."

4. Christianity demands that it be examined in a spirit of seriousness. Any other spirit of examination is wickedness—base unfairness. Shall jurymen be punished for deciding a

case of murder in a trifling spirit—a spirit of ridicule; and the sinner be left free to judge Christianity, *eternal* interests, with impunity? Shall science shut her doors in the faces of triflers and ridiculers, while Christianity admits them into her "holy of holies?" Shall Christianity alone be cast to the ravenous wolves and swine of triflers and scorners? Shall the law of our land hurl its curse upon him who scorns, ridicules your character, who trifles with it and slanders it, who believes there is nothing good within you; and shall not the law of him who sitteth upon the great white throne hurl upon the trifler, the scorner, the slanderer, the disbeliever in Jesus of Nazareth and his word, the terrible, judicial curse, "He that believeth not shall be damned?" The judgment of the great court of this universe curses the man to-day as much as the wicked rabble of Calvary's tragedy who refused to give Jesus —Christianity—a fair hearing that they "might believe." Great truths, great causes, must be examined with a spirit of fear and trembling, with a spirit feeling almost crushed by *responsibility*. Much more must the all-important truth and cause receive such an examination. And if the trifler with these earthly truths and causes must be cursed, doubly cursed must be whosoever never thinks, never thought of the soul's eternal destiny, of Christianity save as an object of wit, ridicule and scorn.

"Within this awful volume lies
The mystery of mysteries;
Oh! happy they of human race,
To whom our God has given grace
To hear, to fear, to read, to pray,
To lift the latch, to force the way;
But better had they ne'er been born,
Who read to doubt, or read to scorn."

5. Christianity demands, as indispensable to belief in the

gospel, that we be willing to *live* it when we have decided it true. Repentance is turning from sin to God with a heart of sorrow for sin and its utter hatred. No man can embrace Christ—his holy law, Godly life, his righteousness—before he is ready to live right. A willing, loving heart to righteousness only can believe the gospel to the salvation of the soul. "Repent ye and believe the gospel" is the order, and not "believe ye the gospel and repent."—Mark i. 15. The Jews were unwilling to repent—turn from their sins—and could not therefore believe. Hence Jesus said to them, "John came in the way of righteousness. . . . Ye repented not . . . that ye might believe."—Matt. xxi. 32. To the disbelieving Jews, who could one day behold the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand and the next say, "What sign showest thou that we may see and believe?"—how shall we know your doctrines?—Jesus said, "If any man will do"—desire to obey God, live right, do the truth—"his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God."—John vii. 17. Our old, corrupt opinions, corrupt beliefs, corrupt lives, must be denied, must be crucified and buried; sinful, proud, corrupt nature, self, must be crucified and buried, that we may arise to new opinions, new beliefs and new lives. Proud self must be humbled that God may exalt us. By death to our darkness, we arise into the light of God; by death to our corruption of belief, we arise into the belief of purity; by death to our death, we arise into our life; by death to our slavery of disbelief, we arise into the liberty of belief; by death to our slavery to sin, we arise into the liberty of righteousness. "If a man be sincerely wedded to Truth he must make up his mind to find her a portionless virgin, and he must take her for herself alone. The contract, too, must be to love, cherish and obey her, not only until death, but beyond it; for this is an union that must survive not only death, but time, the conqueror of death."—Colton. So

Greenleaf, the great authority on evidence, says that in order to believe, "there should be a readiness on our part to investigate with candor, to follow the truth wherever it may lead us, and to submit without reserve or objection to all the teachings of this religion, if it be found of divine origin."—*Test. Evang., p.* 1. Dr. McCosh says: "Argument may be resisted. The conviction springs up naturally, but not necessarily. Men may overcome it, being led into a labyrinth of sophistry from which they can discover no outlet, or more frequently being hardened by an encouraged pride, or sensualized by a course of vice. . . We see how man is responsible for his belief to God. The argument being moral, . . . there is room for the exercise of an evil heart in rejecting it, and, therefore, of a candid spirit in falling in cheerfully with it."—*Intuitions of the Mind, p.* 389. Hume acknowledged that George Campbell had defeated his argument against miracles; yet Hume never believed, and had not so much as the honor to publicly acknowledge he was wrong. And, to-day, the work which Hume acknowledged the "Scotch theologue" had exploded, is used by Hume's followers as though it was reliable. See "Campbell-Owen Debate," pp. 247, 248, for proof. Huxley could not believe in the Bible, but could believe in a little sea mud and dubb it "Bathybius," as the deep sea life, the explanation of life. Strauss, Haeckel, and skeptics, together worshiped this "discovery" as the triumph of infidelity. But "Bathybius" was publicly buried in 1876 as only a little mud; and Moses again raised from the awful death this "discovery" made. See "Biology by Cook, Am. Jour. Science and Arts," for October, 1877. Voltaire could not believe Jesus, but he believed a forged book, and published it as "the most precious gift for which the West was indebted to the East," simply because it helped destroy the Bible.—*Science of Relig., by Muller, p.* 20. Men who can not believe that God created

the world, can believe that it developed itself; men who can not believe that God created man, can believe that

> "There was an ape in the days that were earliest;
> Centuries passed, and his hair became curliest;
> Centuries more gave a thumb to his wrist—
> Then he was a MAN—and a Positivist."

They cry to us:

> "If you are pious (mild form of insanity),
> Bow down and worship the mass of humanity.
> Other religions are buried in mists,
> We're our own gods, say the Positivists."

Once, when Marshall Duroc, an avowed infidel, was telling a very improbable story and expressing his belief in it, Napoleon remarked: "There are some men who are capable of believing everything but the Bible." Ruskin, some time ago, remarked: "Professors Tyndall and Huxley are of the opinion there is no God, because they have not found him in a bottle." Robert Dale Owen, a leading American infidel writer, could not believe in the Bible or Jesus, but he could bow at the shrine of "Katy King," and grow crazy when her great (?) works were exposed as trickery. We have plenty of men who can find little to believe in Christianity and the origin of the Bible, but who can talk eloquently upon the glories (?) of Buddhism, and upon the many thousand years' age of Chinese literature—universally denied by all scholars. These things require no humbling of the soul, no crucifying of self, no virtue of intellect, no new intellectual life, no change into a life of holiness. Hence, they are swallowed without sugar. But whosoever will believe in Jesus must be ready to change himself and do his will. They can not, therefore, believe in him. A celebrated infidel once said to a friend of

his, who had imbibed the same principles: "Only a bad life is against that Bible." Men must have a right heart in order to a right belief; they must have intellectual virtue in order to believing virtue. One of the finest, ablest of living infidels —Lecky—writes: "The phrase, 'intellectual virtue,' . . . is susceptible of a strictly literal interpretation. If a sincere and active desire for truth be a moral duty, the discipline and the dispositions that are plainly involved in every honest search fall rigidly within the range of *ethics*. To love truth sincerely means to pursue it with an earnest, conscientious, unflagging zeal. It means to be prepared to follow the light of evidence even to the most unwelcome conclusions; to labor earnestly to emancipate the mind from early prejudices; to resist the current of desires and the refracting influence of passions; to proportion on all occasions conviction to evidence, and to be ready, if need be, to exchange the calm of assurance for all the suffering of a perplexed and disturbed mind. To do this is very difficult and very painful, but it is clearly involved in the notion of an earnest love of truth."—*Lecky's Europ. Mor., Vol. II., pp.* 200, 201. Truer words were never uttered. They but sum up the considerations I have been urging. *They let us into the secret of unbelief.* They present unbelief in truth as the foul child of pride, stubbornness, selfishness, and of unwillingness to walk in the truth. They present man as walking in the easy, broad road of error and death, rather than to climb the strait and narrow way of truth into eternal life. They present man as preferring to die of sin rather than to live of righteousness. Sir Philip Sidney said: "He that finds truth without loving her is like a bat; which, though it have eyes to discern that there is a sun, yet hath so evil eyes that it can not delight in the sun." There is no such thing as a man believing the gospel (of course there may be intellectual assent to its truth, but this is not true belief) without

willingness to do its commands; there is no such thing as not believing it when the heart desires to do its commands. F. W. Robertson, not "hurt with orthodoxy," remarks; "All truth undone becomes unreal." "If any man"—however great an unbeliever—"will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." "Know, without star or angel for their guide, who worship God shall find him; humble love, and not proud reason, keeps the door of heaven; love finds admission where proud science fails." A good man easily believes in good, a bad man does not.

"Convince a man against his will,
He's of the same opinion still."

Jesus, in whose heart the serpent never trailed, whose heart was unstained, never doubted a word of the Bible—believed all good, and left, as his last message of love, the awful judgment of justice on a corrupt heart, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Let us beware of "an evil heart of unbelief."

6. Unbelief in anything good is itself immoral—wicked. Is any man prepared to deny there is sin in not believing in the purity of a good woman; in not believing in the integrity of a good man; in not believing in purity; in not believing in honesty, justice, and all that is good? Is any man prepared to affirm there is no sin in believing in murder, homicide, suicide, lying, stealing, cheating, fornication, gambling, drunkenness, slander, seduction—is any man ready to say there is no sin in believing in a lie, in believing in anything wrong? Yet, the historian and the expounder of ethics well know that there is not a form of sin or crime which has not many able advocates in literature and practice. These men, such as Lycurgus, Cicero, Aristotle, Plato, Voltaire, Hume, Hobbes, have all, with many others, believed in various crimes. So

do many to-day. Is any man ready to say, it is not wrong to believe in such things? Is any man ready to deny that such belief should cast a man out of society—damn him here and hereafter? Infidel writings say, "Yes; no harm in such beliefs." See Chapter III. of this book.

The heart of unbelief is an "evil heart." Why, then, should not men be damned for disbelieving in the justice and holiness of God's nature? Why should men not be damned for disbelieving in the infinite perfections of him who dwells in inapproachable light? Why should they not be damned for disbelieving in a God so full of love as to give his Son to die to save them? Why should men not be damned for not believing in Jesus? Shall men be free to insult God by disbelieving him, by disbelieving in his glorious law, by disbelieving in Jesus Christ and his gospel? Shall the insult of disbelief which made Sodom, built the fires and burnt the sacrifices of Hinnom, which crucified the Son of God, which made the French Revolution, be housed and fed in the human soul, and yet that soul not be damned? If so, the darkest heart of unbelief is as good as the believing heart of an angel, as good as the believing heart of him who spoke and lived as never man lived! If unbelief, if disbelief is no sin, let us take the disbeliever and scorner of woman's virtue, of man's integrity, of all that is good, into the bosom of our family, let us crown him an angel for his disbelief, for the spotlessness of his heart! God's law and the gospel—the cross—are the embodiment of all that is good among men and angels. Let us rather join the Savior in calling unbelief the child of "an evil heart." Let us join him in saying, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Let us join the angelic host and the glorified in their "voice of many waters," in rejoicing over the judgments of heaven upon the leprous heart of disbelief. The good on earth and the good in heaven join in

harmony to the praise of the justice of God upon a heart so foul as to cast out and outrage the virgin daughter of the heart —faith.

"What is unbelief?
'Tis an exploit, a strenuous enterprise.
To gain it man must burst through every bar of common-sense,
Of common shame—magnanimously wrong."

7. Men are what they believe. If a man believes in theft he is a thief. If a man believes in murder he is a murderer. If a man believes in anything bad he is anything bad. To disbelieve in honesty, purity, anything good, is equivalent to a belief in the contrary—it is the belief in the contrary. There is sometimes a middle between belief and disbelief, but in morals and religion not to believe is, generally, to believe the contrary. All experience and science join the Scripture in saying, "As he thinketh"—believeth—"in his heart so is he." "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not a man."—Matt. xv. 19, 20. As a man is what he believes, and the law and the gospel of God are the essence of all moral good, to disbelieve them is to believe in the contrary. This makes a man a defiled man, unfit for heaven and, by justice on sin, condemned to hell.

THE OUTWARD LIFE IS WHAT THE HEART IS.

The outward life is but the reflection of the heart. "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murder, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." We have seen that the reason men can not believe in good is because they will not "*do* the doctrine." Draper, an infidel, says: "The physical speculations (infidelity he means) of Greece and

Rome ended in sophistry and atheism. . . . As far as could be seen in the times of which we are speaking, the prospects of civilization were dark and discouraging."—*Intel. Develop. of Europ., p.* 120. Of infidel France, Greg—an infidel—speaking of the loss of female virtue, says: "The cause is, they have so little *belief* in their virtue. Such," says Greg, "is the condition of things when *faith* in what is good, reverence for what is pure, and relish for what is natural, has died out of a nation's heart."—*Greg's Lit. and Soc. Judg., pp.* 179, 181. Gen. Charles Lee, who so disbelieved the gospel that he wrote in his will: "I desire that I may not be buried in any church-yard or within a mile of any Presbyterian or Anabaptist meeting-house," was court-martialed and suspended for bad conduct. A harlot was carried through the streets by French infidels and enthroned with great pomp and ceremony as representative of their god. Buckle, Draper, Lecky, and every other honest infidel historian as well as Christian, have recorded every infidel period as the blackness of darkness in morals and religion. (Read A. Fuller's Works, Vol. II., pp. 33–48; Buckle's Hist. Civ.; Lecky's Hist. Mor.; Draper's Intel. Develop. Europ.; Thiers' Hist. French Rev.; Farrar's Hist. Free Thought; Wuttke's Ethics, etc., etc.) The other day an infidel wrote to the *New York Ledger*, asking approbation to poison his wife to get another infidel "young lady" of his neighborhood, claiming to be free from Christianity, and saying: "I pity all who are bound with that galling chain, religious superstition. I am an infidel and glory in my mental freedom."—*New York Ledger* for May 1, 1880. Volumes of such testimony to the curse of unbelief are at hand. But I must close by referring to the testimony of Ralph Waldo Emerson—an infidel—who says: "I confess our later generations appear ungirt, frivolous, compared with the religions of the last or Calvinistic age." Buckle, Hume, Voltaire, Lecky,

Draper, Bolingbroke—every reliable witness, whether Christian or infidel—testify to the influence of religious beliefs in favor of morals and civilization. So that the great German poet, Goethe—once an infidel—confessed: "Epochs of faith are epochs of usefulness; but epochs of unbelief, however glittering, are barren of all permanent good." And Bancroft, the great American historian, who is certainly not dying of "orthodoxy," says: "Good government is not the creation of skepticism. Her garments are red with blood, and ruin is her delight; her despair may stimulate to voluptuousness; she never kindled with the disinterested love of men."—*Hist. U. S., Vol. V., pp.* 22, 24. A great scientist, Sir Humphrey Davy, said: "I envy not the quality of the mind or intellect in others; not genius, power, wit or fancy; but if I could choose what would be most delightful, and, I believe, most useful to me, I should prefer a firm religious belief to every other blessing; for it makes life a discipline of goodness—creates new hopes, when all hopes vanish; and throws over decay, the destruction of existence, the most gorgeous rays of all lights; awakens life even in death, and from corruption and decay calls up beauty and divinity; makes an instrument of torture and shame the ladder of ascent to paradise; and, far above all combinations of earthly hopes, calls up the most delightful visions and plains and amaranths, the gardens of the blest, the security of everlasting joys, where the sensualist and the skeptic view only gloom, decay, annihilation and despair." In conclusion, in the Scriptures, faith, first, is a moral act of the heart; second, reason, principle and experience prove belief or disbelief a moral quality of the heart, in that (*a*) belief depends on a fair examination of evidence; (*b*) on a heart not puffed with pride; (*c*) on a serious examination of Christianity; (*d*) on a willingness to do or *live* the truth; (*e*) in that

belief is a moral thing in itself; (*f*) in that man is what he believes; and, third, belief makes the life.

Nothing good and desirable in heaven or earth can exist without faith. Faith is the golden chain that binds husband and wife together in sweet harmony; faith is the golden chain that binds together individuals and nations in commerce and treaties. Faith is the pillar and ground of the family and of nations. It is the confidence in each other that supplies the love and purity of the family, that builds our railroads and telegraphs, tunnels our mountains and rivers, builds our cities and bridges, plows our rivers and oceans; faith is the confidence in each other that keeps this world from barbarism and from being a hell. The mother of faith in man is faith in God. Faith in God is faith in his justice, faith in his purity, faith in his righteousness, faith in his holiness, faith in his goodness and mercy, and faith in his power and wisdom. It leads man to be like God in goodness and mercy, justice and righteousness. It leads man to love him as the essence of all good; to obey him as the One who commands all good; and in darkness it leads man to look to him for light; in weakness to look to him for strength; in sorrow to look to him for joy; in unrighteousness to look to him for righteousness. This is the cross of Christ; this is the gospel that "he that believeth shall not be damned." Can anything but "an evil heart of unbelief" disbelieve this glorious gospel? And if a good heart is rewarded with life, shall not an "evil heart" be rewarded with death? Shall not disbelief, which destroys all good on earth and would destroy all good in heaven, which strikes into a thousand pieces the golden chain that binds earth together and then binds it to heaven—shall it not be cursed on earth and cursed in eternity, with more than double curse? And shall not he who harbors the vile destroyer of all that is good know what it is to make his heart the den of

this outlaw? Our Lord, who loved as never man loved, therefore declared, "He that believeth not shall be damned." The following explanation and lines I here add as an illustration of how easy the way:

THE DYING KAREN AND HIS TRACT.

[In Dr. Judson's journal of January 12, 1832, he mentions the case of a Karen and his wife, near the head of the Patah River, who, though they had never been baptized, and had never seen the face of a foreign missionary, both died in the faith of the gospel; the man enjoining it upon his friends to have the Burman tract, from which he had learned the way of salvation, laid upon his breast, and buried with him. This tract was entitled, "View of the Christian Religion. The following lines are suggested by the incident.]

He never saw
The book of heavenly wisdom, and no saint
Had told him how the sinner might be saved.
But to his hut
A little *tract*, a messenger of love,
A herald of glad tidings, found its way:
Borne over rapid streams, and deep blue lakes
Embowered in trees, and o'er the waving woods,
Perchance upon the pinions of the breeze,
At length it came. It was not like the bunch
Of brittle palms on which he learned to read;
Its letters were more nice, its texture fair;
Its words—he wondered as he looked on them.
There was some holy love he never knew;
There was a spirit breathing in each line;
He felt unutterable thoughts, as now
He scanned the whole, now read each wondrous word.
It told of God the Maker, and of him
Who died for man's salvation:
He wept and prayed, and mourned a wretched life
Of constant sin, and gave himself to God.
The hue
Of death was on his cheek. His burning brow
Told of the pain he felt. Still no saint was near
To tell of the joys to come. No man of God
Stood by his bed to soothe his final hour.

But he had peace.
"When I am dead," he said, "put ye the little book
Upon my breast, and let it go with me
Down to the sepulchre. It taught me all
That I have learned of God, and heaven, and hell.
I love the man who wrote it, and that God
Who brought it to my home."

THE JUDSON OFFERING.

11. OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS REGARDS PRAYER AS A BASIS TO THE TRUE LIFE.—In the Old Testament are about eighteen different Hebrew words rendered in our version to "pray," "prayer," "praise." They beautifully and aptly represent the various phases of prayer. By consulting the Lexicon, we see that they mean to "pray," to "praise," "confess," "supplicate," "intercede," "glorify," "boast"—in God, to "judge oneself," to "stretch out the hand"—*i. e.*, reach to God for the blessing which he is handing to us; to "bless"—declare blessed; to "deprecate"—*i. e.*, deprecate ourselves and sin. The same thing is denoted by other words and phrases, such as "ask," "call upon." "Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me."—Ps. l. 15. "He shall call upon me, and I will answer him: I will be with him in trouble; I will deliver him, and honor him."—Ps. xci. 15. "As for me, I will call upon God; and the Lord shall save me."—Ps. lv. 16. "I will call upon him as long as I live."—Ps. cxvi. 2; 2 Chron. vii. 14. Prayer being the same to both the Old and the New Testaments, and, like faith, so much assailed, though somewhat diffuse, I will here insert one of my sermons upon the subject:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PRAYER.

"What is the Almighty that we should serve him? and what profit should we have if we should pray unto him?"—Job xxi. 15.

Prayer is the outgushing of the soul to God. Its cry for

blessings is based upon God's ability and willingness to grant them.

1. God commands his people to pray. "Pray without ceasing" is the command God has given us in his word. (1 Thess. v. 17.)

2. God puts the genuine prayer into the hearts of his people. "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which can not be uttered."—Rom. viii. 26. "And I will pour out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications."—Zech. xii. 10. As Harless puts it: "Prayer is 'the emanation and operation of the Spirit, who abides in the redeemed of Jesus Christ.'"—(Rom. viii. 16; Gal. iv. 6.)—*Chr. Eth. by Harless, p.* 308.

3. Prayer is natural to man when he is in harmony with himself and his God. Man lived in communion with God before the fall. (Gen. i. 28; ii. 19, 20.) The fall did not wholly destroy man's spiritual nature. His being "a religious" being is an indication of his glory before the fall. The universal tendency of men to pray is evidence that the fall did not wholly obliterate the prayerful nature with which their Creator endowed them. Herbert Spencer, a leading infidel writer, says: "Under all changes of form, certain religious beliefs remain constant. . . While adverse criticism has gone on from age and age, destroying particular dogmas, it has not destroyed the fundamental conceptions underlying these dogmas."—*Spencer's First Prin., pp.* 14, 15. The universality of prayer, with its prevalence on the brightest pages of modern light, is evidence that it must be classed with those "religious beliefs" which Herbert Spencer acknowledges "remain constant" in spite of all criticism upon religion. The storms of criticism beat upon prayer as one of the Gibraltars

of the religious conditions of men. Like our nature to eat, drink and breathe, prayer universally forms a characteristic of the nature of men who are true to themselves and their God. Knowledge may change, somewhat, our modes and conceptions of eating, drinking and breathing, and so it may change prayer; but it can never remove either of them from our nature. As a man eats, drinks and breathes less, the nearer he is to death; so, the nearer he is to eternal death, the less he feels inclined to pray. When the consumptive lies in the arms of the dread monster, soon to quit this mortal life, he cares nothing for refreshment for the body. When Nero was fiddling at the burning of Rome, as he entered hell, he had lost all tendency to pray. Before proceeding farther, permit me to ask you, my hearers, are you perfectly satisfied without praying?

4. Prayer is an indispensable means of moral or spiritual development. *First.* Prayer is the condition of the indwelling of God in our souls. Harless says: "That which is able to take us out of the domain of the purely earthly tendency of our nature, is to be sought for, not in nature itself, but in God the Creator and Preserver of our nature. . . And it is in the breaking down of these selfish tendencies, that the operation of the Holy Spirit, who enters into fellowship with us, reveals himself."—*Chr. Eth.*, *pp.* 200, 201. Our moral state is as dependent upon the support of God as is our physical state. There can, therefore, be no more life of the spiritual, than of the physical nature of man, without God. (See Anderson on Regeneration, p. 62.) But God does not dwell in and support a prayerless soul. So he, who was filled with the Spirit as never man was filled, said: "Ask and it shall be given you. . . For every one that asketh receiveth." "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the

Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Matt. vii. 7, 8; Luke xi. 12. *Second.* Prayer gives us all the blessings necessary to our spiritual life. It is needless to say that the words of our Savior, just quoted, are but a sample of the promises to answer prayer, with which the Bible is full. We not only need the Holy Spirit to dwell within us, and balance and steady our spiritual nature, but we need God's protection, guidance, preservation, and his supply of our wants, both spiritual and temporal. Of prayer, Shakespeare has well said:

> "And nature does require
> Her times of preservation, which, perforce,
> I, her frail son, amongst my brethren mortal,
> Must give my attendance to."

Looking over the life of man, a greater than Shakespeare has said: "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire but thee. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever."—Ps. lxxiii. 25, 26.

> 'To me that bleeding love of his
> Shall ever precious be;
> Whatever he to others is,
> He is the same to me."

Third. Prayer blesses us in its reflex influence. God could supply both our spiritual and our temporal wants without any anxiety, exertion, or agency of us. But, to do so, would be our ruin. Neither spiritual nor temporal blessings would be appreciated if we received them without our concern; moreover, we would become proud, idle, indolent, diseased, and finally die; we would be spiritually and temporally "blest" to death. Receiving our spiritual and physical necessities without our care, would make us like a child which is raised up

without being taught to care for itself. But, as the hot summer's toil learns the farmer to appreciate his harvests; as the care and the burden of the counter and the counting-room; as the dust, the heat, the noise and the burden of the shop—as these fit the various business men and mechanics to appreciate money, learn them industry and keep them out of temptation and crime; so prayer learns the soul to appreciate its blessings and helps to keep it out of temptation and sin. In a life of industry, either spiritual or temporal, the devil finds little room to build his workshop. *Besides this, the association and fellowship with God in prayer, must necessarily morally elevate the soul.* As you desire to associate with those whose society is as good and better than yours; as you desire to have your children under the influence of such society; so we should desire to associate with God. In earthly matters we understand the elevating influence of good society, whether we will understand it in prayer or not. All history testifies that men have ever, in some measure, understood the influence of Deity over men, through his society. For example of the testimony of history:

"In China, according to Medhurst, the priests of Buddha understand and teach the doctrine of the assimilation of the worshiper to the object worshiped. They say: 'Think of Buddha. If men pray to Buddha, and do not become Buddha, it is because the mouth prays, and not the mind.'"—*Phil. of the Plan of Salvation, pp.* 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43.

I may also refer to the well-known classical illustrations of the degrading influence of Bacchus and the cruel and bloody influence of Mars. Or, I may refer the Bible reader to the horrible influence of Baal and of Moloch over their worshipers; and to the influence of Jehovah over the Jews, by which they were elevated from the most degrading condition of Egyptian slavery, to be one of the greatest nations of antiquity;

by which they were led out of cruelty to tenderness, out of polygamy to monogamy, out of a slave-holding to a slave-liberating nation, out of a barbarous, corrupt, selfish nation, to be a nation of purity, social refinement and abounding charity. History has long ago established the truism, that like Deity, like worshipers. What, then, can be so elevating to man as his association with the just, righteous, pure and holy God? As we come from the mount of communion, as Moses' face shone, our lives must shine with more than an earthly light. Infidels have acknowledged the morally elevating influence of prayer. Of prayer, Prof. Tyndall says: "In some form or other, not yet evident, it may, as alleged, be necessary to man's highest culture. Certain it is, that while I rank many persons who employ it, low in the scale of being, others who employ it form a part of the very cream of the earth. The faith that simply adds (Prof. Tyndall here mistakes false professors for the true ones) to the folly and ferocity of the one, is turned to the enduring sweetness, holiness, and abounding charity and self-sacrifice of the other. In its purer form, prayer hints at a discipline which few of us can neglect without moral loss."—*Pop. Science Monthly*, November, 1872.

Mr. Lecky, another able and representative infidel writer, says: "It has been observed that prayer, by a law of our nature and apart from all supernatural intervention, exercises a reflex influence of a very beneficial character upon the minds of the worshipers. The man who offers his petition with passionate earnestness, with unfaltering faith, and with a vivid realization of the Unseen Being, has risen to a condition which is in itself eminently favorable both to his own happiness and to the happiness of his moral faculties."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. I., pp.* 36, 37. Here Prof. Tyndall and Mr. Lecky strikingly testify to the truth of Cowper's lines, applied to communion with God in prayer: "'Tis there alone (in prayer)

his faculties expanded in full bloom shine out, there only reach their proper use." So John Howard, Wilberforce, Muller, Spurgeon, Cary, Livingston, Morse, Newton, Hugh Miller, Agassiz—the constellation of great men who have led the way in reform, in philanthropy, in science and in invention, have, with a few exceptions, been men of prayer. The first message over the telegraph its inventor made glorify God in the words, "What hath God wrought?" D'Aubigne says: "The 'Reformation' was born in Luther's closet." It was prayer that gave to the Greek and Roman civilizations that moral power which is essential to all true progress and government. "Greek and Roman philosophers often introduce their disquisitions with prayer. The Romans prayed on occasions of all important events."—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. II., p.* 22. Finally, skepticism throws the dagger of disbelief into the heart of prayer. But that dagger, in being driven into the heart of prayer, was driven into the heart of Roman morality and civilization. Dr. Draper, himself an infidel, preaches the funeral of prayer, for that time, when he says: "And in the end were replaced crimes such as the world had never before witnessed and never will again."—*Intel. Develop. of Europ., by Draper, pp.* 187, 190. All experience, true philosophy and history testify that,

> "Prayer, ardent, opens heaven, lets down a stream
> Of glory on the consecrated hour
> Of man in audience with the Deity:
> Who worships the great God, that instant joins
> The first in heaven and sets his foot on hell."

5. Prayer is the closest harmony with reason and the laws of nature

First. What we are to understand by the "laws of nature." The word law is from the Anglo Saxon *legu, lag, lah,* from the root of *lie, lay.* Hence, Webster defines it, "A law is that

which is laid; a rule of conduct or order established by authority." Burke says: "Law is beneficence acting by rule." The Duke of Argyll says that "a law is the authoritative expression of human will enforced by power, and that the phenomena of nature are only really conceivable to us as in like manner the expressions of a will enforcing itself with power." Dr. Reid says: "The laws of nature are the rules according to which effects are produced; but there must be a sense which operates according to these rules. The rules of navigation never steered a ship; the law of gravity never moved a planet." John Stuart Mill says: "The expression, 'law of nature,' is generally employed by scientific men with a sort of tacit reference to the original sense of law, namely, in expression of the will of a superior—the superior in this instance being the Ruler of the universe."—Quoted in *Webster's Dic.* So Dr. John Hall says: "There is no law in the universe but the will of a personal God." Paley says: "A law presupposes an agent; this is only the mode according to which an agent proceeds: implies a power, for it is the order according to which power acts. Without this agent, without this power, which are both distinct from itself, the law does nothing, is nothing." Dr. J. W. Dawson says that "natural laws are the expressions of the divine will;" and that there is a "supreme will behind" them; that they are "under the control of a Lawgiver wise and merciful, not a mere manager of material machinery;" and that he has made his law "in his boundless wisdom and love to meet our necessities."—*The Origin of the World, pp.* 172, 173. Human law is the rule of the State, of the people, and of their rulers. By man it was made and by man it is followed or executed. Moral law is the rule or order of right. By Jehovah it was made and by him it is executed. Such a thing as an eternal, self-made or self-existing, and self-executing law exists in only the frenzied brain of the

disbeliever. So, the laws of nature are only God's ways of governing the world. As Mill says: Scientific men mean that very thing by the expression. Nothing *happens* in the physical world any more than in the moral and political. It is only the action of mind in these three realms. So, in his essay on "Correlation of Forces," Grove says: "Causation is the will creation, the act of God." In his *Logic*, John Stuart Mill says: "The laws of nature do not account for their origin." In one of his last essays Mill, "after rejecting every other argument for the existence of God, admitted that the argument from design in the universe is irresistible, and that nature does testify of its Maker."—*Princeton Review*, for November, 1879. As law can but imply a personal law maker and a personal law executor, ever present in its execution, natural law leads us to see in nature nature's God. Says Lionel Beale: "It is certain that matter is somehow directed, controlled and arranged; while no material force or properties are known to be capable of discharging such functions." (For some of these quotations I am indebted to my brother, Elder A. J. Frost, D. D.) We have, then, scientific men, reason, common-sense and experience informing us that "nature's laws" are God's ways of ruling nature. Beautifully do we find the Bible testifying to these laws: "When he made a *decree* for the rain, and a way for the thunder flash." And again: "He hath established them forever and ever, he hath made a *decree* which shall not pass."—Job xxviii. 26; Ps. cxlviii. 6.

Second. Prayer is based on the omniscience of God. This was implied in what we said on prayer being placed in the heart by the Spirit. Jesus says: "Your heavenly Father knoweth ye have need of these things, before ye ask him."—Matt. vi. 8. This omniscience gives the Spirit of a wise prayer, and is the limitation of prayer to only that which is both good and wise. True, men often seem to pray for foolish things;

but, as *prayer* is first put into the heart—"the breath of God in man returning whence it came" – it is clear that such things are not any part of prayer, but only the fleshly desire of the heart. From this it is clear that we can pray for nothing evil or unwise, to ourselves or to others.

Third. Let us now notice how prayer is in harmony with "nature's laws." I will, first, show how prayer can be answered, by ignoring the true meaning of "natural law," upon the extreme evolutionist theory, namely: that when God made the world, as the boy says, he "set it agoing," and it has been a thing uninfluenced by him ever since; run only by some kind of a law that guides and controls and gives power to itself—a kind of perpetual motion. Let it not be forgotten, that, if he made such a world, he made it to fulfill his purposes. He, therefore, arranged it as a clock is arranged, to strike at a certain hour; to, at a certain time, perform a certain thing. As the clock-maker saw how to arrange the clock to strike twelve at a certain time, and did so arrange it, so God saw how to arrange the world to bring about certain answers to prayer at certain times, and did so arrange it. Thus, we may suppose he arranged nature, to divide the Red Sea and the Jordan; to stop the revolution of the earth; to bring on the flood; to prevent the fire from destroying the Hebrew children; to prevent the rain, etc., etc. If it be answered that this implies too much knowledge, and foresight, and power, the answer is: Nothing, not inconsistent with righteousness and wisdom, is "too much" for God. And, besides, it implies no more than this extreme evolutionist theory implies; for, according to it, God must have arranged nature to perform everything it is performing, from the greatest to the least, and that, too, with the utmost certainty and precision. If it be asked, Why pray, if the world is arranged to bring the answer to prayer? the answer is: Pray because God says pray,

and because prayer is a part of the plan, or a condition in nature to bring about the result given in answer to prayer. As well ask why do anything, if there is such a previous arrangement of nature?

But, as we have seen from the definition of the "laws of nature," given by the highest scientific authority, which is based on experience, common-sense and fact, God did not thus construct the world. I, therefore, will show how God answers prayer according to what *are* "laws of nature." The testimony of scientific men is given in the words of the greatest living biologist, when he says: "It is certain that matter is somehow directed, controlled and arranged; while no material force or properties are known to be capable of discharging such functions." Taking, then, "nature's laws" as being only God's rule or way of governing the world, we have no difficulty in seeing how he answers prayers. To be particular:

1. We have seen that it is his rule to morally elevate man through prayer. As Mr. Lecky, an infidel, supported by Prof. Tyndall in the statement, says: "It has been often observed that prayer, by a *law of our nature*, exercises a reflex influence of a very beneficial character upon the minds of the worshipers."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. I., pp.* 36, 37. Thus, intelligent infidels concede that it is the office of one of the "laws of our nature" to make us better men and women by prayer. Or, in the language of the definition of nature's laws—God's *way* to make us better in prayer.

2. We have called attention to all history as proving that our fellowship with the object of our worship makes us like that object. This, then, is another of "nature's laws." It is so settled and can never be different till God changes our nature. Apply this law to prayer, and we see how God makes us better in prayer.

3. We have called attention to all history as proving that

nations are built up and perpetuated by the moral support of prayer. It is, therefore, one of the laws of nature to build and keep up nations through prayer.

4. We have seen that it is a law of nature that God breathes into us the breath of prayer, to return to him, as the vapor returns from the earth, to be returned back again to water our souls with moral refreshings from heaven.

5. But we now notice, especially, the influence of prayer over physical nature. Were we to admit that prayer has no influence over physical nature, from the facts just given, it is settled that prayer is the power and lever of the moral world, and that it can not therefore be dispensed with without moral ruin. But I am fully convinced that its power is manifest in the physical world. As proof of its power in the physical world, observe, first, it is a law of nature that mind controls matter. All science and civilization witness to the power of mind over matter. Prayer controls matter directly and indirectly. It controls it indirectly as it causes us to act differently upon the world; it inspires us with a sense of the superiority of mind over matter, with a sense of our sovereignty of this world, and with a sense of our moral responsibility. This leads us to rightly rule, subdue, multiply and replenish the earth. Out of this has grown the glory of our civilization. Again, prayer directly influences nature; it brings the divine mind to act directly upon nature in certain ways. Thus, it led him to stop the earth in its rotation, to prevent the rain, to quench the flame, stop the mouths of lions, open the prison doors, and raise the dead.

There is nothing unreasonable in presuming that the divine mind controls matter. We know the human mind controls it so as to remove disease; subdue mighty conflagrations; plough rivers and oceans; make hot water and make ice; tunnel mountains and rivers; change climates and seasons; dip the

water from rivers and make it pull carriages at a mile a minute; and seize the lightning and make it, in a moment, whisper in a brother's ear on the other side of the globe. Why, then, doubt that the divine mind controls nature? We are but tiny infants—nor even worthy of that comparison—and if *we* can perform such wonders in nature, why should it be thought strange that God should perform wonders that dazzle us by their glory? If we, but "worms of the dust," can perform wonders, the half of which is not yet known or dreamed, why should we limit the infinite, Holy One of Israel? The heathen poet, Horace, had more truth in him than many now have, for he wrote:

> "Who guides below and rules above,
> The great Disposer and the mighty King;
> Than he, none greater, next him none,
> That can be, is, or was;
> Supreme he singly fills the throne."

If it be supposed that such mighty deeds upon the part of God, would lead him to violate and revolutionize nature, the reply is: Why not say that man had better stop his great achievements over nature, lest he violate and revolutionize it? Why not forbid a skillful physician from curing a case which an unskillful one can not cure, lest he should violate and revolutionize nature? If great achievements over nature threaten us with "the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds," let us have Congress pass a law against the rolling of the wheel of progress over nature. Is natural law any more violated by the civilized man than by the barbarian? How, then, does the right exercise of Almighty power violate nature's laws? But we have seen that "nature's laws" are only God's way or rules of action upon nature. How, then, can any one suppose that he violates his own way by his own way? For this

is all that the objection amounts to. Are "nature's laws" violated when the boy stops the ball from falling as he catches it; when the firemen extinguish a mighty conflagration; when mountains and rivers are tunneled, and the lightning is chained and harnessed? How, then, can "nature's laws" be violated when the Almighty, in answer to the prayers of his people, clothes and feeds the believing poor, binds up the bleeding, broken heart, strengthens the feeble knees and supports the hands from falling under burdens? Does he violate his rule of goodness, love and mercy in conforming to it?

While this is not the age of miracles, if it were, there could be no objection to prayer for miracles. As Prof. Tyndall says: "If you ask me who is to limit the outgoings of Almighty power, my answer is, not I. If you should urge that if the Builder and Maker of this universe should choose to stop the rotation of the earth on its axis, or to take the form of a burning bush, there is nothing to prevent him from doing so, I am not prepared to contradict you."—*Tyndall's Frag. of Sci., p.* 421. Miracles are but the greater or unusual actions of the divine mind upon nature.

Again, says our infidel friend, Prof. Tyndall: "The theory that the system of nature is under the control of a Being, who changes phenomena in compliance with the prayers of men, is in my opinion a perfectly legitimate one. . . . It is a matter of experience that an earthly father, who is at the same time wise and tender, listens to the requests of his children, and if they do not ask amiss, takes pleasure in granting their requests. We know, also, that these requests extend to the alteration, within certain limits of the current events of the earth. With this suggestion, offered by our experience, it is no departure from scientific methods to place behind natural phenomena, a universal Father, who, in answer to the prayers of his children, alters the currents of phenomena. Thus

far, theology and science go hand in hand."—*Popular Science Monthly*, November, 1872. Lord Bacon said: "It is true that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate, and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity." I borrow a few illustrations:* "In the reign of Queen Elizabeth of England, and Philip II. of Spain, there arose a contest which involved the fate of millions. Protestant and Catholic Europe were on the eve of a terrible religious war. Protestantism was on her knees; Catholicism in arms. At length *The Invincible Armada*, the greatest fleet of all time, was launched upon the sea; but, remember, God holds the sea 'in the hollow of his hand.' It sailed up the English Channel in the form of a crescent, the horns of which were seven miles apart. England 'cried unto the Lord in her trouble, and he saved her out of her distress.' The God of nature saw fit to combine the wind and storm and sea in such a manner as to utterly destroy the Spanish Armada, so that not a single individual of that mighty armament was permitted to desecrate the soil of England. Protestants and Catholics alike were amazed at this signal intervention of Divine Providence. There was a threefold verdict rendered. The people said: 'The Armada was invincible to man, but destroyed by the Lord;' the Queen said: 'God breathed and they were destroyed;' Philip II. said: 'I bow to the decrees of heaven.'"

Take another illustration from English history. Just one hundred years after the destruction of the Spanish Armada, the religious liberties of England were again threatened by the

* From Rev. A. J. Frost, D. D.

treachery of James II. in his endeavors to subvert the government and establish popery. The Christians of the realm invited Prince William of Orange to come over from Holland and help them. He acceded to their request, raised an army and set sail, but the wind was unfavorable. A day of fasting and praying was observed, that wind and tide might favor the enterprise. "The Protestant wind," as it was styled, came; the fleet sailed, and to quote from English history: "The wind that blew briskly from the East detained the king's vessels of war helplessly in the Thames, while it carried the fleet of the prince prosperously down the channel—it turned to the South when he wished to enter Torbay; it sank to calm during the disembarkation, and as soon as the disembarkation was completed, it rose to a storm and met the pursuers in the face. So remarkable was all this, so timely and favorable was each particular change, that pious men naturally regarded it as nothing less than the interposition of God in answer to their prayers."

Take one more illustration from the history of our own country: In 1746, the French fitted out a powerful fleet for the destruction of New England. These forty ships of war were under the command of the Duke d'Anville, and set sail from Nova Scotia. New England was fasting and praying. The people prayed for a tempest, and while in the act of supplication—though the day had been calm—the storm arose in great fury, and a great part of the fleet was wrecked on the coast of Nova Scotia. The Duke d'Anville and the second general in command committed suicide, many died with disease, thousands were drowned, and the enterprise was abandoned forever.

CONCLUSION.—1. We have seen that the Bible and the scientific men are agreed that "nature's laws" are God's ways, or rules of acting upon matter.

2. That God's rule is, to act upon both spirit and matter in answer to prayer.

3. That all true prayer "is the breath of God in man, returning whence it came;" and is, therefore, limited by the wisdom and the goodness of God.

4. That prayer is a blessing to man, directly and indirectly —by reflex influence and by *direct and positive answers* being given.

5. That we can not dispense with prayer. For it is the moral support and moral growth of individual and national life.

To these things let us add,

First. Inasmuch as prayer is in such complete harmony with "nature's laws"—God's ways of blessing us – to not pray, is to violate nature's laws; which, considering our necessities which are met only in prayer, must result in our suffering want and eternal moral ruin.

Second. In the language of Prof. Dawson, one of the greatest of living scientific men: "If the universe were a mere chaos of chances, or if it were a result of absolute necessity, there would be no place for intelligent prayer; but if it is under the control of a Lawgiver, wise and merciful, not a mere manager of material machinery, but a true Father of all, then we can go to such a Being with our requests, not in the belief that we can change his great plans, or that any advantage could result from this if it were possible, but that these plans may be made in his boundless wisdom and love to meet our necessities."

Third. In the language of Prof. Dawson, again: "The position of the Bible is thus the true mean between superstitions at once unhappy and debasing, and a materialistic infidelity that would reduce the universe to a dead, remorseless machine, in which we must struggle for a precarious existence, till we

are crushed between its wheels."—*Origin of our World, pp.* 172, 173.

Fourth, and finally. To him who asks, in the skeptic's language quoted in our text: "What is the Almighty that we should serve him? and what profit should we have if we pray unto him?" we answer: Much every way. He is the Maker and ever-present Ruler of this universe. To all that call upon him, he is a tender Father; the world is his house; he is our Father; we live in his house; he built this house for those who love and trust him; the world—this house—is for his children, and not they for the house. "When the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job xxxviii. 7), it was because they heard the "Builder and Maker" of this house declare that it was good—good, not to shut the Father from his children, stop the hand that feeds them, close the bosom in which they were to be carried, and crush out their life and joy as a juggernaut of materialistic fate; good, not because the children were made for the house, but good because the house was made for the children; good, because its every door and window, hinge and lock, was made to be opened and shut by the Father for his children; good, because its every department is fitted up to cheer and make glad the heavenly fireside. Prayer presents us around our Father's table, in his house, with our Father having girded himself with goodness and love, feeding us, binding up our bleeding and broken hearts, from Calvary's basin washing our sin-wounds. Prayer is the key to light, to righteousness, to peace and joy, to immortality and glory—to all that we can think of that is good, and more too. In the language of the poet laureate of England, Tennyson:

> "More things are wrought by prayer
> Than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice
> Rise like a fountain for me night and day;

For what are men better than sheep or goats,
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer,
Both for themselves and those who call them friend.
For so the whole round world is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

12. JESUS CHRIST AND THE ATONEMENT WHICH HE MADE ARE FUNDAMENTAL TO OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS.—The Hebrew word for atonement is כָּפַר—*kaphar*. It means "to cover over sins; *i. e*, to forgive, . . . to expiate a crime. . . . . To cover over sin, to hide, spoken of God as the offended party; *i. e.*, to forgive sin, to pardon sin. . . . . Spoken of the offender or his representative, to cover, to hide; *i. e.*, to do away by some expiatory act, to purge, so that he may be pardoned; hence, to expiate an offense, fault, to make expiation for an offender, to free him from guilt."—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* Nowhere is there the idea of mere covering, or concealment in the word, as relates to the subject of the atonement. חָפָה —*chaphah*, כָּסָה—*kasah*, and others, are used to indicate such covering as that. כָּפַר—*kaphar*—occurs about seventy-five times. In all these occurrences, it includes or implies the covering of sin only through satisfaction to the offended Moral Governor. Says Prof. Smeaton: "Every Jew was aware that, in consequence of transgression, he was liable to the penalty which must follow; and, in a word, that there was no enduring covenant, and no free access to the Holy One without a complete fulfillment of the law. No approach could otherwise be allowed to God's presence in the sanctuary services; and there was, besides, a conscious guilt, which tended to estrange the sinner from God, and to make him apprehensive. This was an education of the people in the knowledge of sin. To meet this deep-felt need of pardon, and as a method of remitting

the penalty incurred by a violation of the letter, sacrifices were appointed which operated on the conscience of the Jew in a peculiar way. They gave him a vivid view of the guilt of sin, and of the rectitude and holiness of the divine government. The whole Old Testament was calculated to bring into prominence the necessity of the atonement, and to sharpen the conviction that sin required a higher sacrifice, presupposed the sinful deed, showed the inviolability of the law and covenant."—*Atonement, Vol. I., p.* 48. "Conscience demands a satisfaction or atonement. . . . Till the waters of reparation and punishment quench it, guilt burns in the human heart—nay, it would continue to burn in the human heart forever, if there was no sufficient atonement; so that they who would have pardon merely by God's retreating from the demand of satisfaction, would be followed, if they had their wish, by the inward pursuer wherever they went. And even as their holiness grew, they would be haunted by a keener sense of guilt, remembering that they were the same person still and that no reparation had been made. They would be disturbed by self-accusations, by shame and a gnawing of conscience, till they would long to have the faculty of memory destroyed."—*Idem, p.* 51. In picturing Lady Macbeth, that peerless reader of the laws of human nature, Shakespeare, emphasizes the need of atonement.

Doctor.—Look how she rubs her hands?

Gentleman.—It is the accustomed action with her to seem thus washing her hands. I have known her to continue in this a quarter of an hour.

Lady Macbeth.—Yet here's the spot!

Doctor.—Hark! she speaks. I will set down what comes from her.

Lady Macbeth.—Out, damned spot! out, I say, . . . Here's the smell of the blood still. All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand.

Doctor.—More needs she the divine than the physician. God, God, forgive us all! —*Macbeth, Act V., Scene 1.*

"Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from thy hand? No: this my hand will rather
The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
Making the green one red.
Methought I heard a voice, 'Sleep no more!
Macbeth does murder sleep!'—the innocent sleep,
Sleep that knits up the raveled sleeve of care,
The death of each day's life, sore labor's bath,
Realm of hurt minds, great nature's second course
Chief nourisher in life's feast.
Still it cried, 'Sleep no more!' to all the house:
'Glamis hath murdered sleep; and, therefore, Cawdor
Shall sleep no more, Macbeth shall sleep no more.'"

Lady Macbeth.—Consider it not so deeply.

Macbeth.—But, wherefore, could I not pronounce "Amen?" I had most need of blessing, and "Amen" stuck in my throat.

Lady Macbeth.—Those deeds must not be thought after these ways: so, it will make us mad.

Man, with sin unatoned, can have no peace, falls into despair of righteousness and peace, and beyond all hope of the true life. Through life, through all eternity, he roams an exile from God's government, lashed by the scorpion lash of conscience:

"The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven."

Without the atonement, the deliverance, in the old Latin proverb—"*Si vis fugere a Deo; fuge ad Deum*"—"If you wish to flee from God, flee to God"—can be of no avail; for, to the unsatisfied conscience, "God is a consuming fire;" to such a conscience, his hand of blessings waves only the flaming sword of vengeance.

Sin, having separated man from God, justice, unsatisfied by the atonement, forbids that God should commune with or favor him. Hence, regeneration, repentance, faith—in fact, all the basis of ethics, noticed in the preceding eleven points, being dependent on the power and encouragement of God's favor, are ineffectual without the atonement. The atonement offers to man the help, encouragement of a reconciled God; without it, God is to man but a just and terrible Judge, certain to "destroy without remedy." Under the terrible sight of Lady Macbeth's bloody hand, which can be washed white by only the atonement, man is but the hopeless creature of despair. The only hope of mortal man is the "blood that washes white as snow."

"My God is reconciled,
He owns me for his child,
I can no longer fear."

"How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
In a believer's ear;
It soothes his sorrows, heals his wounds,
And drives away his fear."

The atonement is also the expression of the holiness of God, of the holiness of the law, and of the heiniousness of sin.

First. The atonement measures the holiness of the law by what is requisite for its satisfaction. Only the infinite value of the "blood of Jesus Christ" was sufficient to meet the requirement of violated, insulted holiness. In the infinite value of the satisfaction, we, therefore, have the measure of the requirement of the infinite holiness of the law.

Second. The moral blackness, depth and guilt of sin is measured by the atonement. Had sin been but an imperfection, or the infidel "fall upward," or the infidel "justifying of everything," man could not have been subject to the holy law of

which he is the subject. Or, had man been responsible in but a small measure, being but a little above the brute—a little higher than infidelity places him—sin could have been only such a trifle as that but a low price could have "redeemed" the sinner and have washed the "bloody hand." But, when we see that only the blood of the Son of God can redeem and wash the "bloody hand," we tremble before the terrible nature of the sin that leaves the stain; and in horror *shrink back* from the sin that leaves the "bloody hand."

Third. In the atonement is the certainty of the unwashed sinner's doom. The atonement shows the hand so "bloody," the doom so certain, that—in awful reverence let it be written and read—before the sight, the infinite God stands powerless, as the Just God, to rescue, before justice is satisfied. His love bursts out in pity; fills the cup of justice with the blood "that washes white as snow;" clasps the lost one to his bosom; carries him in triumph to the cleansing fountain; over death, hell and the grave carries him to glory!

Fourth. In the atonement is exhibited the terrible punishment of the finally impenitent. Spurning the way of salvation, the sinner can but meet the terrible punishment of that holy law, of which the blood of the Son of God only could satisfy. (Heb. ii. 1–3; iv. 1–5; John iii. 18; Mark xvi. 16; Matt. xxiii. 37, 38; xxv. 46; Ps. i. 6.) What a fearful question for us, dear reader: "*Who* among *us* shall dwell with the devouring fire? *Who* among *us* shall dwell with everlasting burnings?"—Isa. xxxiii. 14. Measuring the punishment by the infinite price requisite to meet it in our Redeemer, we have the "everlasting burnings," the "devouring fire," heat up "seven times hotter."

Fifth. In the atonement appears the moral significance and the dignity of man. For a merely developed ape, for a being

of any less moral significance and dignity than man, no such atonement could have been required.

Sixth. In the atonement appears the blessings of obedience to the moral law. The blessing of obedience must correspond to the extent of the curse of disobedience. In the extent of the curse of sin, measured by the atonement, we have the measure of the blessing of righteousness.

Seventh. In the atonement is exhibited the love of God. By the sacrifice of the cross is measured the love of God to man. "God *so* loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—John iii. 16. "God commendeth his *love* towards us, *in that*, while we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us."—Rom. v. 8. Touching are the lines of the poor, blind girl, filled with joy by the sight, from this love, into that "within the vail:"

"Could we with ink the ocean fill,
And were the sky of parchment made
Were every blade of grass a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade;
To write the love of God with ink
Would drain the ocean dry;
Nor would the scroll
Contain the whole,
Though spread from sky to sky."

Eighth. Through the atonement, set upon everything we do, from the least to the greatest, secretly or openly, we see the all-seeing eye of the Moral Governor and Judge. In our strict accountability for "all these things," met in the atonement, we have this manifest. Through the atonement rings in our ears:

"If I ascend into heaven, thou art there:
If I make the under world my bed, lo, thou art there.

If I should take the wings of the morning,
Should dwell in ihe uttermost parts of the sea;
There also would thy hand lead me,
And thy right hand would hold me.
And if I say, Only let darkness cover me,
And the light about me be night;
Even darkness will not hide from thee,
And night will shine as the day;
Darkness is as the light."

—Ps. cxxxix. 7–12—*Conant's Ver.*

Ninth. The atonement teaches that the moral law is universal. In the atonement being for all mankind, we see the reign of the moral law over white and black—of every color, every kindred, tribe, nation and tongue; of all ages and all lands.

Tenth. In the atonement we have the universal moral nature and brotherhood of man. "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."—Rom. iii. 23. In the design and the adaptation of the atonement for all, we have the same moral nature and moral condition of men; and in this sameness of nature and condition, we have preached to us: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell upon the face of the earth."—Acts xvii. 26. This brotherhood, scattered and alienated by sin, the atonement reunites in one family and in one band of love. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all."—Col. iii. 11. It is related of the Duke of Wellington that, at the "Lord's Table" at his parish church, a very poor old man, having gone up the opposite aisle and reaching the communion rail, knelt down by the side of the Duke, when some one, coming and touching him on the shoulder, whispered to him to move farther away until the Duke had received the bread and wine, the eagle eye and quick ear of the great commander catching the meaning of that touch and

whisper, he clasped the poor, old man's hand, held him to prevent his moving away, and, in a reverential manner, exclaimed in a distinct undertone: "Do not move, for we are all equal here."

Eleventh. The atonement delivers and secures man from a guilty conscience and from despair. Having satisfied the law, into his heart it pours peace and light; though friendless and outcast, it gives him "the Friend above all others"—reception into the Father's house. To the saved it is, "All things work together for good."—Rom. viii. 28. From melancholy it saved poor Cowper, and electrified his pen with the divine truth that fills his hymns. Goethe's cruel dagger, which, in despair, he placed by his bed to let out his life before morning, it threw away, and lighted up his heart with light and filled it with joy that made life cheerful and happy, and his literature pure from the fearful poison of skepticism with which it had been filled. In the language of an infidel, Lecky: "The power of the love of Christ has been displayed in the most heroic pages of Christian martyrdom, in the most pathetic pages of Christian resignation, in the tenderest pages of Christian charity. It was shown by the martyrs who sank beneath the fangs of wild beasts, extending, to the last moment, their arms in the form of the cross they loved; who ordered their chains to be buried with them as the insignia of their warfare; who looked with joy upon their ghastly wounds, because they had been received for Christ; who welcomed death as the bridegroom welcomes the bride, because it would bring them nearer to him."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 10. Of the influence of this love, says Lecky: "To them the universe was transfigured by love. All its phenomena, all its catastrophes were read in a new light, were endued with a new significance, acquired a religious sanctity. Christianity offered a deeper consolation than any prospect of endless life, or

millennial glories. It taught the weary, the sorrowing and the lonely, to look up to heaven and to say, 'Thou God carest for me.'"—*Idem, pp.* 11, 12. "God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."—Rom. v. 8.

Twelfth. The atonement presents our duty towards the fallen, needy and suffering. The great, loving, pitying, helping heart it lays against ours, pours into ours. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."—Rom. viii. 9. As he loved all, pitied all, helped all, was the "good Samaritan," so must we be; "for the servant is not greater than his Lord." Jesus poured out his love into our bitter cup to sweeten it; so ought we to pour ours into the cup of others.

From the throne of the atoning God, through the atonement, flow all these twelve virtues "for the healing of the nations;" the atonement is the fountain of "the river of water of *life.*"—Rev. xxii. 1. See Isa. liii.

Two objections to the atonement here call for notice.

1. "It is wrong for the innocent to suffer for the guilty." Reply, *first.* The doctrine of the atonement is not, in the sense here objected, the suffering "of the innocent for the guilty." The atonement is the legal *oneness* of Christ with his people. He was born under the law, under their curse. See Gal. iv. 4, 5. "He was acting for his people, and they were representatively in him. The entrance of Christ's sinless humanity with the law in his heart, became the central point of all time, to which previous ages looked forward, and after ages look back. He was the living law, the personal law—an event with a far more important bearing than any other that ever occurred. It was the world's new creation. It is made ours not less truly than if we ourselves had rendered it, in CONSEQUENCE OF THE LEGAL ONENESS FOUND BETWEEN US AND HIM. Not that in the Lord's experience the

personal was merged into the official, for he had not, and could not have, any of the feelings which stand connected with personal guilt. He was always conscious of inward sinlessness when the sin-bearer and curse-bearer in our stead."—*Smeaton on the Atonement, Vol. II., p.* 124. So, "For he made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."—2 Cor. v. 21. On this passage, Smeaton well says: "The words, strictly considered, therefore, mean that by God's appointment he was made sin, not in mere semblance, but in reality; not before men, but before God, on the great foundation of federal unity between him and his people."—*Smeaton on the Atonement, Vol. II., p.* 226. "The sin-bearing capacity of Jesus proceeds on several presuppositions: a community of nature, and a federal relation between the surety and those in whose behalf his work was undertaken. Without these, no basis could have existed for imputation or punishment; for penal suffering had its formal ground in guilt."—*Idem, p.* 228. See, also, *God with Us, by Hovey, p.* 133; *Martin on the Atonement, pp.* 40–47.

Being born under the law, born in our place, ONE WITH US in the eye of the law, he was officially (not personally) under our curse. In no other sense did Christ suffer the innocent for the guilty.

Second. If it should be urged that this is "the innocent suffering for the guilty," I reply, substitutionary suffering is not unusual. The following facts show the world is governed by such substitution: *a.* In the place of our perishing bodies animals have to perish for our food. Whether animal or vegetable life, life is continually substituted for life. *b.* As one animal feeds on another, life is substituted for life. *c.* In our late war, those who had nothing to do with causing the war suffered for the sin of others. Many of those who caused it were sleeping in their graves while their children were wiping

out their *national* guilt with their own blood. *d.* The volunteers died upon the battle-field for those who remained at home. *e.* The man who was drafted and furnished a "substitute" died in the death of his substitute – as his substitute died for him. *f.* One nation wrongs another. In a bloody war the wronged nation makes the other wipe out the wrong in blood; yet many of those who wipe it out are personally innocent, having had nothing, personally, to do with originating the wrong. *g.* The surety in the law of our land often suffers in paying the debt of the one for whom he is surety. This, too, when the principal has sinfully let him pay the debt. These seven instances of substitutionary laws ought to make one careful how he disclaims against substitution. We are all, to a greater or less extent, in both moral and material things, dependent on others; they live *for* us, and we live on them.

The Guest in the statesman of Plato remarks: "It is difficult to fully exhibit greater things without the use of patterns." Lord Bacon remarks that, "As hieroglyphics come before letters, so parables come before arguments. And, even now, if any one wishes to let in new light on any subject into men's minds, . . . he must still go the same way, and call in the aid of similitudes." Thus, throughout the universe, the Lord has given us these patterns or similitudes of the great atonement. Thus Milton says:

> "The earth
> Is but the shadow of Heaven and things therein,
> Each to the other like, more than on earth is thought."

That these illustrations, in all things, are like the atonement is not claimed.

Again: Let us remember, as Hume confessed, and as every one must confess, that we know, of ourselves, but very little

of these great things. Let us remember that we are fallible. He who sets himself up and says that he may not be wrong in this objection to the atonement, sets himself up as an infallible Pope. To tell which is the worse Pope, an infallible infidel Pope or an infallible Romish Pope, is difficult. The claim of each is a better evidence of his being a poor, erring creature than it is of his wisdom.

2. It is objected that, in cold blood, an outlaw, with a shot-gun, murders "a good moral man," is sentenced to die for his crime, repents, goes to heaven, while the man he murdered went to hell.

In reply to this—*First.* Consider what sent "the good moral man" to hell. *a.* The objection seems to assume that the shot-gun sent him to hell. Verily, this is shot-gun theology. It is a new discovery in ethics, that shot-guns send men to hell! *b.* The "good man's" *sins* sent him to hell. If his sins merited hell, who shall rebel or protest against his receiving justice, whether he was murdered or died a natural death. That his sins sent him to hell is evident from the fact that, unless he was fearfully self-conceited, were he living, he would not claim perfection. Yet, so far as he was imperfect, he was a sinner. Again: That his sins sent him to hell is evident from the fact that all must agree to David's language: "I have seen an end of all perfection."—Ps. cxix. 96.

It is, again, evident from the universal testimony of Scripture, that "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be *justified* in his sight."—Rom. iii. 23, 20. Again: That he was sent to hell for his sins is evident from the fact that, nowhere in the Bible or the doctrine of the atonement as held by the orthodox world, is there anything implying that good men—sinless men—are sent to hell. *c.* The "good man" had opportunity, all his life, to be saved through the atonement.

He had rejected God's offer of mercy to save him. He was lost because he would not be saved.

Let it, then, be remembered that this "good man" was not a good man according to the holiness of the law; that he was sent to hell deservedly, for *sin;* and that he had always refused the atonement—God's mercy.

Second. Consider the case of the murderer.

1. There is no promise anywhere in the Bible that any one may sin till death, then repent, and be saved. *a.* In the Scriptures *all* the invitations and promises are for *to-day.* Man is warned that to-morrow is very uncertain for his salvation. *b.* This is emphasized by the fact, that few over middle age ever are saved. *c.* And by the uncertainty of death-bed repentance. That scarcely one in one hundred of those who have made profession on what they thought were their death-beds, ever proved their profession genuine by a better life, after their recovery, is a settled fact. And the vast majority of these never had any recollection of their 'brilliant conversion' experienced on their sick-beds. Dr. Jackson, of Boston, an eminent Christian physician, observed this, and was led to keep an account of cases who professed conversion on sick-beds. Out of three hundred, of which he kept account, only two proved their conversion genuine on their recovery. He could not say that these two had not a silent hope before sickness. Abraham Booth kept a similar diary; and only two in three hundred proved their conversion genuine on recovery. A London missionary kept a record of two thousand such cases; on recovery, only two per cent. of these proved their conversion genuine. The probability is that most or all of these were converted before sickness.—J. R. Graves, LL.D. These facts give little room to believe that men who have all their lifetime spurned a blood-bought mercy can, in their last hour, to escape hell, receive it. And there is absolutely not

a shadow of promise in the whole Bible of such a thing. The assumption that this jail or gallows repentance is generally, if ever, *genuine*, and saves men, is not a doctrine of the *atonement*—of the Bible, but of men's fancies. The thief on the cross was an exception. He probably never before had an opportunity of accepting the Savior. But these criminals are raised under the gospel.

2. But, suppose some of these outlaws are thus saved. If any of them are saved, they are saved: *a.* Upon a *genuine* remorse and turning away with all their hearts from *sin*. *b.* They are saved in just the way the so-called "good man" could have been saved. *c.* They are saved by being made holy; so that their lives, on earth, or anywhere else, could never again be criminal, but good. *d.* They are saved, not in violation of law, but by the Savior having suffered for them. Can any man object to such a salvation? Is it not rather a reason for glorying in the cross—the cross that can make a pure, righteous man out of such a character? Would you rather prefer that this criminal should never be a better man?

That God saves such, if possible to do so, there is no doubt. But if he does, it is not revealed in connection with the atonement; and facts seem to disprove his doing so. Remember, the atonement must be judged by what the Bible alone makes it.

Third. The infidel's doctrine here: 1. According to the infidel doctrine of no such thing as sin, while the outlaw violated custom or manners, he violated no *moral law*—he committed no *sin* and no crime. 2. According to the infidel doctrine of no future, both the murdered and the murderer went to the *same* reward—nothing. 3. According to the infidel doctrine there was no possible punishment, beyond time, for the murderer. If he escaped the law here, no punishment ever for him. Read, in this connection, Chapter III.

At the close of an infidel lecture, a German came forward and requested a private conversation. The lecturer consented. "Ish de doctrine you breach here to-night true?" "Certainly true," replied the lecturer. "Vel, den," rejoined the German, "pe sure you must keep it a secret from Chake Tavis." "Why, so," replied the lecturer. "Pecause," said the old man, "Chake Tavis has stole one-half of my smit tools already; and if he find out dare is no hell, or punishment, pe sure he will come and steal de palance."

We may add another answer to this objection against the atonement, viz: If the atonement were based on principles of wrong, surely its believers, who are the only ones, as we have shown, who steadfastly maintain the moral nature of man, the existence of the moral law, the responsibility of man and the existence of sin would as readily recognize—if there were such—the moral wrong in the atonement as those do who know nothing of moral law, man's moral nature, his responsibility, and the existence of sin. Strange, indeed, that those who know nothing of such a thing as sin—moral wrong—should be the only ones who can find moral wrong in the atonement!

We might farther present, as an answer to the objection, the acknowledged good fruit of the atonement by even infidels. Though the atonement is the origin and power of Christianity, there is no respectable infidel scholar who calls in question that Christianity has been of inestimable benefit to mankind. See such as Lecky, Buckle, *et al.*

The atonement, according to the Old Testament, is Jesus Christ—"wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; the Lord having "laid on him the iniquities of us all." —Isa. liii. In Jesus Christ and his atonement we, therefore, have peace, encouragement and help to virtue; redemption from hell to heaven, from sin to righteousness, from shame to

glory. Every basal plank to Old Testament Ethics is, thus, dependent upon Jesus Christ and his atonement. While some of the basal facts to Old Testament Ethics might, in some measure, ameliorate man's ethical life upon earth, without the atonement, without the Man of sorrows, lifting up the sinful world, these facts would have upon ethics scarcely a perceptible influence. As Harless remarks: "Last of all, the whole barrier which men erected in their laws and worship against moral degeneracy, crumbles down in the hands of those very parties for whom it ought to hold good."—*Sys. Chr. Eth.*, *p.* 94. As Lecky confesses: "Philosophy was admirably fitted to dignify and ennoble, but altogether impotent to regenerate mankind. It did much to encourage virtue, but little or nothing to restrain vice." Then Lecky turns to Christianity: "It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which, through all the changes of eighteen centuries, has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments and conditions; has been not only the highest pattern for virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice; and has exercised so deep an influence, that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists. This has, indeed, been the well-spring of whatever is best and purest in Christian life."—*Hist. Europ. Mor.*, *Vol. II.*, *pp.* 4, 9. But, though overlooked by Mr. Lecky, this is equally Old Testament Ethics. In the types, shadows, etc., Christ was preached to them of olden time. So that both Christ and his apostles preached this same "well-spring of whatever is best and purest in the Christian life" from the Old Testament. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he *saw*

it, and was glad. . . . . Before Abraham was, I am."—John viii. 56, 58. "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of *me*. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words."—John v. 46, 47. "Search the Scriptures [only the Old Testament was then written]; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me."—John v. 39. "All Scripture [only the Old then] is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, *thoroughly* furnished unto all good works."—2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. "And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ."—1 Cor. x. 4. In no plainer language could we be told that the "well-spring of whatever is best and purest in the Christian life" was in Old Testament days "the same spiritual drink." On Pentecost—see Acts ii.—Peter preached that great revival sermon from the Old Testament. To the eunuch, Philip preached Christ from Isa. liii.—compare Acts viii. with Isa. liii. As but few of such innumerable facts, see Acts xvii. 11; xviii. 28; xxvi. 6–27; Galatians, especially the third and fourth chapters, and that galaxy of Hebrew saints in Heb. xi.

While so many other constituents of Old Testament Ethics are so important, that to place them here in its basis would hardly, if at all, be improper, this will close the classification of the constituents to the foundation. That the eleven, classified in this chapter as basal to Old Testament Ethics, prove Old Testament Ethics to be not of this world but of heaven, the writer believes with such belief that he would rest his all for time and eternity upon. Were there not another line added to this work, so forcibly do the eleven preceding points

establish the ethics of the Old Testament that this book deserves the title of "Old Testament Ethics Vindicated."

Having pointed out the foundation of Old Testament Ethics, we are prepared to advance in the investigation.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SABBATH AN ESSENTIAL PART OF OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS.

THE following are some of the inestimable blessings of the Sabbath:

1. The Sabbath calls man's attention to the spiritual as above the material world. It calls attention to spirit above matter; eternity above time; to home above the camping-place on our short pilgrimage to eternity. Men may so place their affections on the material things—of this world—that their souls become as *gross* as the world itself.

2. The Sabbath affords opportunity for religious instruction, meditation and devotion. Not that our religion is to be only a "Sunday religion;" but that one day in the seven for religious culture, exclusively, is indispensable to religion for other days.

"The Sabbath . . . recollecting of the personal spirit from the distractions of the outer life into the calm of meditation; man is not at liberty to completely merge himself into earthly, temporal cares; should constantly have before him, in all his temporal activity, also the eternal as the true and highest good. The heathen either buries himself up in temporal activity and enjoyment, or contemptuously turns himself away from the same; the saint of the Old Testament lives and acts in God's good-created world, but does not merge himself into it, withdraws himself into the Sabbath repose of a heart in communion with God. In the simple feature of

Sabbath observance itself, the Old Testament morality presents itself in sharp contrast to all heathen ethics and places the moral task of man higher than the latter."—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., pp.* 155, 156.

Infidels, denying there is any more immortality or spirituality in man than in the tadpole, or clod that rumbles in upon his coffin, can not see any use for the Sabbath.

3. The Sabbath affords opportunity for rest for the mind and the body.

4. The Sabbath affords opportunity for rest for the laboring animals.

5. The Sabbath is a priceless boon for especially the poor. *a.* It secures to them the privileges of family life. Six days the laboring and the business men are deprived of the privilege of family communion. Were it not for the Sabbath, they would soon need an introduction to their own families. But on the Sabbath they can commune with their families around the fireside, in all the privileges of home, and in the sanctuary. *b.* It cultivates domestic love. This guards the sacredness of the family from intrusion and destruction by the tempter. When we remember that where the Sabbath is destroyed by confinement to seven days' business or labor, there are so many "scandals," we need not be surprised. For the family is almost the same as broken up; the yearning for companionship becomes only a temptation, to seek the gratification of its wants in "vanity fair" and at the table of forbidden fruit. This may be regarded as an unwise view of things. But let history speak. "But we must revert for a moment to France, which at one time exchanged Popery for atheism, the Sabbath for the decade. The experiment showed that infidelity was, even more than a corrupt religion, detrimental to the family. What the institution suffered from the worship of a strumpet, let the following facts declare: The National

Convention enacted a law permitting divorce, of which there were registered within about a year and a half 20,000 cases; and within three months 562 cases, or one to every three marriages in Paris alone. . . . . Infancy was committed to the tender mercies of State nurseries, in which nine out of ten died; a system which, by infanticide and disease, had, in fifty years, reduced by one-half the population of the Sandwich Islands, and were it to be universal and permanent, would, in a few centuries, nearly depopulate the earth. The worship of (atheism) the Goddess of Reason, who had been able to bestow nothing of that endowment on her votaries, was abolished, and the law of divorce was modified, and then repealed." But the chilling effect of infidelity was not destroyed. "A chilling egotism dried up all the springs of sentiment. The domestic affections are extinct. Domestic crimes, parricides, the murder of husbands by their wives, and wives by their husbands, are almost," says a French writer, "as common as larcenies were wont to be."—*The Sabbath, by Gilfillan, p.* 232. Greg's "Literary and Social Judgments"—Greg is an infidel—confirms this picture of France—the effect of infidelity. So do Le Play and others. "When the code of September 25, 1791 (infidel), for the first time among a civilized people, established the principle that seduction is neither a crime nor the violation of any contract, manners at once received a sad blow. . . . . It is so incorporated in the population, that marriage became more and more sterile, while there is one illegitimate in every three births. . . . The idle subsidize an army of courtesans, the workmen renounce marriage, and, in certain classes, concubinage has in a manner become a professional business."—*Le Play's Org. of Labor, pp.* 163, 164—a comparatively recent work. Under the influence of the London City Mission, between 1859–1860: "Shops closed on the Lord's Day, 293; persons who have become commu-

nicants, 1,236; backsliders restored to Church communion, 253; drunkards reclaimed, 1,102; fallen females rescued, 524; unmarried couples induced to marry, 300; family prayer commenced, 587. So in Scotland, Polynesia, etc."—*Gilfillan on the Sabbath, p.* 236. "In NewHampshire there are two neighborhoods—one of six families, the other of five. The six families . . . . . never visited the sanctuary. Some of them totally disregarded the Sabbath, and all eventually formed the habit. In the course of years, five were broken up by the separation of husband and wife, and the other father becoming a thief, and fleeing to parts unknown. Eight or nine of the parents became drunkards, most of whom have found a drunkard's grave. One committed suicide, and nearly all have suffered for the wants of life. Of some forty-five descendants, about twenty are known to be notorious drunkards, jockeys or gamblers. Four or five are, or have been, in State's prison. One fell in a duel. Some entered the army and have never been heard from; others have gone to sea and never returned. And only a small number remain within the knowledge of their friends. Some are in the alms-house. Only one of the whole is known to have become a Christian. The others were all sure to be seen, riding or walking to the house of God. . . . They all lived in peace and were prospered in their labors. A large number were reared up around them, numbering now, with their descendants, from two to three hundred. . . . . In only one instance has there been committed by any of their descendants a crime, which was followed by a speedy and deep repentance; and but one is known to be intemperate. Some of them are ministers of the gospel. One is a missionary to China. A number are supporters and officers in churches. There has been among them no separation of husband and wife, except by death, and no suffering for want of

the necessaries of life. The heads of the families lived to a good old age, and with a score or more of their descendants, have gone down to the grave in peace, most of whom have left evidence that they died in the Lord. The homestead of a number of the families is now in the hands of the third generation. A colony has been planted by the descendants in the West, maintaining the institutions of their fathers, and now reaping the benefits of Sabbath-keeping habits and principles."—*Gilfillan on the Sabbath, pp.* 238, 239.

To multiply statements of such facts is easy; they abound on every hand, in every age and country.

c. The Sabbath is a constant rebuke to the worldly capitalist, and a security against his oppressive hand. To him it says: "Though you overload the poor with burdens during six days, you shall leave him a free man one day in seven. Then he *shall* have opportunity for social, family and religious communion—rest." But where there is *no* day in the seven which the laboring man can call his own, he had better be dead—better have never been born; he is the most abject slave.

The Sabbath teaches the capitalist that his laborers have *souls*, privileges and rights which he must respect. This respect, cultivated in the breast of the capitalist for his laborers, renders him humane. It influences him to treat his laborers, not as a cruel driver treats a brute, but as those having equal rights with himself. This leads to fairness and honesty in all his relations with his employes. Communism, and all the great labor questions that to-day shake our country to its very foundation, have their origin in the fact that the Sabbath is so near lost to us. The capitalist has his heel upon his employes; the employes are in suspicion and rebellion; and this state of things will never be better till we restore the Sabbath. On the contrary, it will grow worse as Sabbath desecration

grows. Religion is the only hope of the working classes. Yet many of them cast it from them.

Blackstone, the great jurist, says: "Profanation of the Lord's Day is a ninth offense against God and religion, punished . . . by law. For, besides the notorious indecency and scandal of permitting any secular business, ... and the corruption of morals which usually follows its profanation, the keeping of one day in the seven holy, as a time of relaxation and refreshment as well as public worship, is of admirable service to a State, considered merely as a civil institution. It humanizes, by the help of conversation and society, the manners of the lower classes, which would otherwise degenerate into ferocity (communism parading our streets, etc., as illustrations) and savage selfishness of spirit; it enables the industrious workingman to pursue his occupation in the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness; it imprints on the minds of the people that sense of their duty to God so necessary to make them good citizens (witness the infidelity, communism, crime, etc., of our time); but which would be worn out and defaced by unremitted continuance of labor, without any stated times of calling them to the worship of their Maker."—*Chitty's Blackstone, Vol. II., p.* 63. Speaking of the Sabbath, Lecky—an infidel—says: "An important boon to the servile classes."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 558.

Science has demonstrated the necessity of the Sabbath. A few years ago "an Englishman, engaged in the manufacture of iron, determined that no work should be done in his furnaces on the Sabbath. His books testified that he now made more iron in six days than he had before made in seven; that he made more iron in a given time in proportion to the hands employed, and to the number and size of his furnaces, than any other establishment in England, which was kept in

operation on Sabbath. This was due to the rest enabling them to work so much better.

Few, if any, of the steamers on the Western rivers lie by on Sabbath. Of the boatmen and firemen who do not refrain from work on the Sabbath, seven years are said to be the average life. A master of an Ohio canal boat, alluding to the enfeebling influences of Sabbath labor on the boatmen, said: "It will take about five years to clear them off." "An eminent statesman of England attributed the length of his life and the superiority of his health to his invariable observance of the Sabbath."—*Wayland's Moral Science*, quoted. "William Pitt died of apoplexy at the early age of forty-seven. . . . Sabbath brought no rest to him, and soon the brain gave signs of exhaustion. . . . Under the high tension, both brain and body perished prematurely. A few years since, one of the most active business men of England found his affairs so extended that he decided to devote his Sabbaths to his accounts. . . . Wealth came upon him like a flood. He purchased a country seat at the cost of four hundred thousand dollars, determining that he would now have rest and quiet. But it was too late. As he stepped upon his threshold, after a survey of his late purchase, he became apoplectic. If his life still exists, he is only the wreck of a man."—Taken from *Hall's Jour. of Health.*

That profound skeptical scholar, Ewald, remarks: "The Sabbath, though the simplest and most spiritual, is at the same time the wisest and most fruitful of spiritual institutions. Nothing could be devised which would both supply what was lost in the tumult of life, and effectually turn his thoughts to the higher and the eternal. Thus it becomes the true symbol of the high religion which now entered into the world, and the most eloquent witness to the greatness of the human soul which first grasped the idea of it." For the following, I am in-

debted to President Hovey, of Newton Theological Seminary: "In the time when, in France, they believed themselves to have abolished all established customs, . . . the seven-day week was thrown aside, and they made the trial of the decade. . . . A French workman, who lived at the time, said: 'The decade was very far from attaining its object; it did rather the contrary. Say what one will, our Sunday is the right one. When this was no more, there was no regular work-day.'"

Prud'hon, whom no one would suspicion of forming his judgment on religious grounds, says: "If the week is shortened by one day, then the need of recreation is not yet pressing; if it is lengthened by one day, then over-fatigue results; if one gives half a day free in every three days, it causes lack of method and irregularity; if, on the contrary, after twelve days' labor, two days' holiday are given, the workman is ruined with idleness after he has been exhausted with work." Dr. Paul Niemeyer, whose work on "The Sunday Rest from the Standpoint of Physics" (Berlin Denickes, publisher, 1876) is crowned with the first prize by the above-named Swiss society, says: "The length of time in which the elasticity of the human body will be exhausted by service in the same calling and a full pause be required, amounts to six days. If the seventh is likewise spent in work, it causes overstrain, and, therefore, gradual ruin of the active elasticity. Is it, on the contrary, devoted to recreation, this elasticity proves a strength to our body and a guarantee for far more important endurance than that of the lifeless machine, which, in time, wears itself out. The body, instead of growing weary, grows tough; yes, work itself is a chalybeate draught and proves itself more healthful than idleness." Could we not, however, obtain the same object without sacrificing a whole day? Would it not be more just to work for seven days in the week instead of

six, but to leave off work on each of the seven days at a corresponding earlier hour? Dr. Niemeyer says: "The pauses for rest in the course of the week's work are, in respect to the work, simply as a question and answer, as the rising and falling of a forge. True recreation will be only attained by a complete suspension of the whole working system." Then a whole day must be given free, and this day must, in accordance with the lunar system lying at the foundation of the whole computation of time, be the seventh. Dr. Niemeyer replies to this: "Some years ago, before the time of railroads, when large freight wagons transported merchandise for hundreds of miles from East to West, where they were from eight to nine weeks on the road, the following wager was entered into by the friends of Sunday rest with the opponents: Two wagoners, with similar wagons, similar roads, similar loads and teams, were to start on a Monday morning on the same journey; the lover of the Sunday, with his team, should rest each Sunday; the other, however, should travel on that as on other days. . . . The daily journey of the freight wagons to the appointed inns was about thirteen to eighteen miles; so the opponent advanced on the first Sunday thirteen or eighteen miles further than the other, and so forth. In the sixth week, however, the latter gained the advantage, and, with his well-cared-for horses, came in and reached the goal in time; while the beasts of the former, over-driven, came in late." This account is remarkably instructive. Nearly all competent persons who have investigated this subject thoroughly have come to the same conclusion. Therefore, Macaulay is quite right when he says of England: "If in this country the Sunday had not, for the last four hundred years, been hallowed as a day of rest; if work had been carried on, on this day, with the ax and spade, hammer and club, we should have been a much poorer and less civilized people." Ernest Curtius (Pro-

fessor in the Philosophical Faculty of Berlin University) expresses the same opinion: "The Sunday rest," he says, "has been preserved as an institution which does not injure practical activity, but maintains and increases the power of the people. It is indispensable, if the united religious life of a people is to have expression; it is a continual monition that man belongs to two worlds, and that he can not, without doing irreparable injury to his soul, wear himself out in the increasing whirl of the visible world. Where this regulation of life is kept, it is the most beautiful ornament of town and country; for in life, as in art, all that is beautiful and pleasing depends on order which rules every moment and on the rhythmic organization of the various parts. In this respect, the spiritual is distinguished from the brute life; and the soul, inspired, from the mechanical movement. Therefore, nothing is more lacking in beauty than a barren aimless and endless work, making human life to resemble an ant-hill, where, day in and day out, all run against each other in unresting hurry." Dr. Niemeyer sums up the result of his studies: "Sunday rest is the first thing demanded in the *regimen* designed to promote quiet and steady growth of society; and, as such, is more an intellectual than a religious arrangement. To the individual it gives assurance of enduring power to earn his livelihood, a contented habit of mind, a well-cared-for old age; to the bread winner, it is the foundation of a good household economy; to the government, it insures peace and order in public life; for all it is a means of measuring the sound sense which exists among the people in general, and the advance which it has made in civilization."

Sir David Wilkie, the famous painter, gave as the result of his observation, that "the artists who wrought on Sunday were soon disqualified from working at all."

The omnibus drivers, who work sixteen hours every day in the week, seldom pass fifty years of age.

Sir David Wilkie said: "He never knew a man to work seven days in the week who did not kill himself or his mind."

In August, 1843, Charles Bianconi, a well-known car proprietor in Ireland, read a paper before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at Cork, in which he stated that he had then in his employment one hundred vehicles, performing daily 3,800 miles, with 1,300 horses, and added: "The establishment is not at work on Sundays, with the exception of those portions of it which are in connection with the post-office or canals, for the following reasons: First, the Irish being a religious people, will not travel on business on Sundays; and, secondly, experience teaches that I can work a horse eight miles per day in six days in the week for seven days, and by not working on Sundays, I effect a saving of twelve per cent."

Dr. Benjamin Richardson, the leading sanitary authority in England, not long ago delivered a lecture in London upon the "Vitality of the Jews and the Mosaic Sanitary Code." After giving some interesting statistics as to the large portion of the Jews who reach old age, Dr. Richardson took up the causes of this longevity, chief among which were the observance of the laws of Moses. "Its provisions," he said, "form a marvelous collection of sanitary rules. The rest enjoined upon the seventh day is a most important provision for health, which, if strictly obeyed, would insure to any nation an extra term of life."

Mr. Corliss, the builder of the enormous engine for Machinery Hall at our great Centennial, speaking on whether to open on Sunday, said: "My opinion on that point is very decided, and I am very free to express it. All the good that would be accomplished by this Exhibition will be neutralized

if opened on Sunday; and it would better never have been opened. The result will be disastrous to the morals of the community if the laws of God and man are to be thus set at defiance. The laboring men, likewise, have great interests at stake, and the tendency would be to give the employer great advantage over his workmen, as it would ultimately lead to breaking down the barriers that now protect his one day in seven; and, in the end, the demand for labor would exceed the supply. This we may not see now; but it will surely come, and the opening of the Exhibition on Sunday will be but the entering wedge."

A South German paper, not long ago, contains a remarkable confession of Ernst Keil, the proprietor and publisher of the well-known *Gartenlaube*, and who died not long ago. When this paper, the anti-Christian character of which, it is said, can not be mistaken, reached, in 1867, an edition of 225,000, Keil wrote as follows, to a friend: "That is a success of which I may well be proud, for the work is, editorially and in its management, mine and mine alone. But, if any one asks me if it has made me happy, I have only a sad answer to give. For fifteen years I have had only this one thought, which, day and night, and everywhere, has ruled me with a demon power, robbed me of the remaining joys of life, made me a solitary man, and often, in its effects, produced unspeakable misery for me and my family. Fifteen years of the finest portion of my life I have buried myself in work, *have had no Sunday*, have withdrawn from my friends and lived for business. Notwithstanding the means at my disposal for traveling, I have, with the exception of a tour in Switzerland, seen nothing of the world; and if my weary bones be stretched out to-morrow, people will say, 'He was a fool.' The conducting of such a work is a curse which holds one bound with iron cramps and, at last, smashes life, while all that has

been gained is a successful number. In six years I have had only three days of recreation. Ambition may be satisfied by the success of such a paper, but happiness can not be found in it. I have found this out by experience."

Poor Kiel! He truly said the world will say, "He was a fool." But the Old Testament had said it long before the world said it: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God."—Ps. xiv. 1; liii. 1. "The way of a fool is right in his own eyes: but he that hearkeneth unto counsel is wise."—Prov. xii. 15.

Thus history, moral and physical science, infidel testimony and experience, unite in holding up the Old Testament in its Sabbath characteristic as incomparably above infidelity and heathenism.

"Birds can not always sing;
Silence at times they ask to nurse spent feeling,
To some new bright thing,
Ere a fresh burst of song, fresh joy revealing.

"Flowers can not always blow;
Some Sabbath rest they need of silent winter,
Ere from its sheath below
Shoots up a small, green blade, brown earth to splinter.

"Tongues can not always speak;
O God, in this loud world of noise and clatter,
Save us this once-a-week,
To let the sown seed grow, not always scatter."

Would that through and above the noise and strife, disappointment and sorrow, anxiety and weariness, destruction and death, moaning and wailing, of a lost world, the words of Old Testament Ethics—"REMEMBER *the Sabbath-day to keep it holy*"—might ring; for they "have forgotten their *resting place*."—Jer. l. 6.

CHAPTER V.

Essential to Old Testament Ethics is the Revelation of the Moral Law.

While man has perceived and discovered many wise rules to govern life, the history of ethics clearly teaches that many things which are essential to ethics have been left unperceived or undiscovered. To stop long and prove this, is not the purpose of this book; nor is much proving it necessary. From the previous chapter, we can come to no other conclusion than that the revealed law is necessary to ethics. Else, why has there never been found any true and adequate conception of man's moral condition, destiny, and the nature of the great principles and facts underlying these, outside of the Bible?

All other than Bible Ethics are but speculations, or, in a few instances, possibly mythological revelations. In no case is ethics, outside of the Bible, essentially a revealed ethics. Wuttke says of Aristotle's ethics (in Aristotle, Grecian and heathen ethics attained its highest perfection): "Only, relatively, a few general thoughts are scientifically developed; by far the larger part is treated empirically and aphoristically. Aristotle expressly renounces all attempts at scientific strictness of demonstration and development; the subject does not admit of this, but only of probability. Hence, the form of presentation . . . . sinks not infrequently into dry common-sense observations; and lingers, for the most part, within the sphere of the popular grasp."—*Eth.*, *Vol. I.*, *p.* 93.

Lecky, an infidel, says: "Nature does not tell man that it is wrong to slay, without provocation, our fellow-man."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 19. Draper, an infidel, acknowledges: "The physical speculations of Greece and Rome ended in sophistry and atheism."—*Intel. Develop. Europe, p.* 120. Turn to Chapter III. of this book for the ethics which "reason" gives; and see how Draper's words find illustration in all ages.

Ethics outside of the Bible are of as little value as national laws outside of national law books or records. Reason is worth as little in governing men in moral matters as it is in national matters. All governments must have revealed or written laws—revealed authoritatively by the law-making and law-executing power. History proves this is no less true of the moral government of God—of ethics. Without such a revelation of ethics, in the language of Hume: "The whole is a riddle, an enigma, an inexplicable mystery; . . . . such is the frailty of human reason."—*Hume's Essays, Vol. II., p.* 469. So Buckle, another infidel, says: "Now, it requires but a superficial acquaintance with history to be aware that this (moral) standard is constantly changing, and that it is never precisely the same in the most similar countries, or in two successive generations in the same country. . . . . This extreme mutability in the ordinary standard of human actions, shows that the conditions on which the standard depends must themselves be very mutable; and those conditions, whatever they may be, are evidently the originators of the moral and intellectual conduct of the great average of mankind."—*Hist. Civ., Vol. I., p.* 129. Infidel writings are full of such concessions as this by Mr. Buckle.

Greg, an infidel, well says: "Their imperfect culture, and their low stage of intelligence, demands absolute *certainty* and *positive* dogma. Doctrines which resulted from a mere bal-

ance of probabilities, which were, and avowed themselves to be, simply the conclusions of mature and enlightened reason, would have no adequate hold on (men's) their belief. Laws of conduct laid down as imperative, merely as being conformable to the sound instincts of sound natures, as plainly conducive or indispensable to the good of mankind and of themselves in the long run, would have no adequate hold on their belief. . . . . They need . . . the announcement, '*God spake these words, and said.*'"—*Enig. of Life, pp.* 245, 246.

The great jurist, Blackstone, says: "Undoubtedly the revealed law is infinitely more authentic than that moral system which is framed by ethical writers, and denominated the natural law; because one is the law of nature, expressly declared so to be by God himself; the other is only what, by the assistance of human reason, we *imagine* to be that law. If we could be as *certain* of the latter as of the former, both would have an equal authority; BUT, TILL THEN, THEY CAN NEVER BE PUT IN COMPETITION TOGETHER."—*Ch. Blackstone, Vol. I., p.* 28, *sec.* 42. (Read here *Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation, pp.* 272–274.) This is one of the causes of the abiding, powerful and widening influence of the Bible. This enabled the Bible to civilize the Jews, civilize Europe and America. Other ethics, in that in which they are true, are almost a dead letter.

CHAPTER VI.

The Ten Commandments the Constitution of Old Testament Ethical Laws and Regulations.

Old Testament Ethics are well known to have been given to a people who were to be governed by a politico-ecclesiastical government—a kind of mixture of civil and ecclesiastical government. The ethics of the Old were, therefore, to govern the Jews in their individual and in their national capacity. We have seen what are the basal principles and facts to this ethical government.

The ten commandments sustain the relation to the statutes and regulations of Israel that the constitution of a State or of the United States sustains to its statutes and regulations. In other words, the ten commandments were the moral constitution of Israel; the other laws and regulations were the statutes. The reader will, from this fact, readily see that none of the laws and regulations of Israel can conflict with the ten commandments; and that their interpretation and ethics must be according to the ethics of this constitution. Let the reader carefully, here, read and compare Ex. xx.–xxiii. Then compare these with Ex. xxxiv. 1. Dr. Rufus P. Stebbins says these were "a code of rules based upon the ten laws or commandments."—*A Study of the Pentateuch, p.* 29—note. And Dr. Stebbins quotes Davidson: "The Proverbs are ethical maxims, deduced from the Mosaic law and divine Providence."—*Idem, p.* 128. Remember that neither

Prof. Stebbins nor Prof. Davidson are members of the "evangelical" side. "On the basis of these, it may be conceived that the fabric of the Mosaic system gradually grew up under the requirements of the time."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. II., p.* 163. The following are a few points from *The Decalogue*, by that master of Old Testament learning, Prof. Fairbairn, D.D.: "1. The very manner in which these commandments were given is sufficient to vindicate for them a place peculiarly their own. For these alone, of all the precepts which form the Mosaic code, were spoken immediately by the voice of God; while the rest were privately communicated to Moses, and by him delivered to the people. Nor was the mode of revelation merely peculiar, but it was attended also by demonstrations of divine majesty, such as were never witnessed on any other occasion. . . . . 2. The same may also be inferred from the number ten, the symbol of completeness. It indicates that they formed by themselves an entire whole, made up of the necessary, and no more than the necessary, complement of parts. . . . . 3. It perfectly accords with this view of the ten commandments, and is a further confirmation of it, that they were written by the finger of God on two tables of stone—written on *both sides*, so as to cover the entire surface, and not leave room for future additions, as if what was already given might admit of improvements; and written on *durable tables of stone*, while the rest of the law was written only on parchment or paper. . . . . Hengstenberg . . . justly remarks: . . . 'The stone points to the perpetuity which belongs to the law, as an expression of the divine will, originating in the divine nature.' It was an image of the truth uttered by our Lord, 'Verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.' 4. Then these ten words, as they are called, had the peculiar

honor conferred on them by being properly the terms of the covenant, formed at Sinai. Then Moses, when rehearsing what had taken place, says (Deut. iv. 13): 'And he declared to you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments, and he wrote them upon tables of stone.' Again, in chapter ix. 9, 11, he calls those tables of stone, 'the tables of the covenant.' So, also, in Exod. xxxiv. 28, 'The words written upon tables, the ten commandments,' are expressly called 'the words of the covenant.' To mark more distinctly the covenant nature of these words, it is to be observed that the Scripture never once uses the expression, 'the tables of the law;' but, always, simply 'the tables of the testimony,' or conjoining the two, 'the tables of the testimony or tables of the covenant.' It is true some other commands are coupled with the ten, when, in Exod. xxxiv. 27, the Lord said to Moses, that 'after the tenor of [at the mouth of, according to] these words, he had made a covenant with Israel.' It is true, also, that at the formal ratification of the covenant —Exod. xxiv.—we read of *the book of the covenant*, which comprehended not only the ten commandments, but also the precepts contained in chapters xxi., xxiii.; for it is clear that the book comprised all that the Lord had then said, either directly or by the instrumentality of Moses, and to which the people answered, 'We will do it.' But it is carefully to be observed that a marked distinction is still put between the ten commandments and the other precepts; for the former are called, emphatically, 'the words of the Lord,' while the additional words, given through Moses, are called 'the judgments' (verse 3). They are, indeed, for the most part, peculiarly rights or judgments, having respect, for the most part, to what should be done from one man to another; and what, in the event of violations of the law being committed, ought to be enforced judicially, with a view of rectifying or checking the evil. . . .

5. What has been said in regard to the ten commandments, as alone properly constituting the terms of the covenant, is fully established; and the singular importance of these commandments further manifested, by the place afterwards assigned them in the tabernacle. The most sacred portion of this—that which formed the very heart of all the services connected with it—was the ark of the covenant. It was the peculiar symbol of the Lord's covenant presence and faithfulness, and immediately above it was the throne on which he sat as king in Jeshurun. But the ark was made on purpose to contain the tables of the law, and was called the 'ark of the covenant,' simply because it contained the 'tables of the covenant.' The book of the law was afterwards placed by Moses at the side of the ark. . . . . But the tables on which the ten commandments were written alone kept possession of the ark, and were thus recognized as containing in themselves the sum and substance of what in righteousness was held to be strictly required by the covenant. 6. Finally, our Lord and his apostles always point to the revelation of law engraven upon these stones as holding a pre-eminent place, and, indeed, as comprising all that, in the strict and proper sense, was to be esteemed as law. . . . . We should despair of proving anything respecting the Old Testament dispensation, if these considerations do not prove that the law of the ten commandments stood out from all other precepts enjoined under the ministration of Moses, and were intended to form a full and comprehensive exhibition of the righteousness of the law in its strict and proper sense."—*The Typology of Scripture, by Fairbairn, Vol. II., pp.* 78–83.

In this connection, Fairbairn quotes from Bahr, a great German scholar, to whom, though doctrinally unsound, "much praise is due for having laid the foundation of a more profound and systematic explanation of the symbols of the Mosaic

dispensation": "The decalogue is representative of the whole law; it contains religious and political, not less than moral, precepts. The command is purely a religious one; as is also the fourth, which belongs to the ceremonial law; and indeed, generally, by reason of the theocratic constitution, all civil commands were at the same time religious and moral ones, and inversely; so that the old division into moral, ceremonial and political, or judicial, appears quite untenable."—*Typol., Vol. II., p.* 84, from *Symbolik, Vol. I., p.* 384. While Bahr has confounded different things, the element of truth in his statement is, that the ten commandments are, clearly, the constitution of Israel. Let the reader read Ps. xv., xxiv., xl. 1; Isa. i., lvii., etc.; Micah vi.; Rom. ii. 17–23; iii. 10–18; vii. 7; xiii. 9, 10; 1 Tim. i. 7–10; Deut. vi. 5; Matt. xxii. 40.

Having clearly proved that the ten commandments are the constitution of Israel, based upon the Great Basis of ethics, as pointed out in Chapter III. of this book, for convenience I here copy the following admirable analysis of this constitution, made by Hengstenberg and Fairbairn: "Thou shalt not injure thy neighbor—1. In deed—and that (1) not in regard to his life; (2) not in regard to his dearest, his wife; (3) not in regard to his property generally. 2. In word ('Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor'). 3. In thought ('Thou shalt not covet'). . . . . That a special prohibition of sinful lust should follow the rest, shows that what has been said in reference to word and deed *primarily* has respect to these. Still, it must not be overlooked, on the other hand, that precisely through the succession of deed, word and thought, the deed and word are stripped of their merely outward character, and referred back to the root in the mind; are marked simply as the end of a process, the commencement of which is to be sought in the heart. If this is duly

considered, it will appear that what primarily refers only to word and deed, carried at the same time an indirect reference to the emotions of the heart. Thus, the only way to fulfill the command, 'Thou shalt not kill,' is to have the root extirpated from the heart, out of which murder springs. While that is not done, the command is not fully complied with, even though no outward murder is committed. For this must be dependent upon circumstances which lie beyond the circle of man's proper agency."—Quoted by Fairbairn. And Fairbairn adds: "There is less depth and comprehensiveness in the first table, as the learned writer has remarked, and a similar regard is had in it to thought, word and deed, only in reverse order, and lying somewhat less upon the surface. The fourth and fifth precepts demand the due honoring of God in deed; the third in word; and the two first, pointing to his sole Godhead and absolute spirituality, require for himself, personally, and for his worship, that place in the heart to which they are entitled. Very striking in this respect is the announcement in the second commandment, of a visitation of evil upon those that *hate* God, and an extension of mercy to thousands that love him. As much as to say, it is the heart of love I require; and if ever my worship is corrupted by the introduction of images, it is only to be counted for the working of hatred instead of love in the heart. So that the heart may truly be called the alpha and the omega of this wonderful revelation of law: it stands prominently forth at both ends; and had no inspired commentary been given on the full import of the ten words, looking merely to these words themselves, we can not but perceive that they stretch their demands over the whole range of man's active operations, and can only be fulfilled by the constant and uninterrupted exercise of love to God and man, in the various regions of the heart, the conversation and the conduct. . . . . With

manifest reference to the second table, and with the view of expressing in one brief sentence the essence of its meaning, Moses had said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' (Lev. xix. 18); and, in like manner, regarding the first table, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might' (Deut. vi. 5). It is against all reason to suppose that these precepts should require more than what was required in those which formed the very ground-work and heart of the Mosaic legislation; and we have the express authority of our Lord for holding that the whole law, as well as the prophets, hung upon them (Matt. xxii. 40). In the Sermon on the Mount, also, he has given us an insight into the wide reach and deep spiritual meaning of the ten commandments, clearing them from the false and superficial gloss of the carnal Pharisees. And to mention no more, the Apostle Paul, referring to the law of the ten commandments, calls it 'spiritual, holy, just and good;' represents it as the grand instrument in the hands of the Spirit for convincing of sin; and declares the only fulfillment of it to be perfect love. . . . . As a necessary consequence, the two grand rules: 1. That the same precept which forbids the *external* acts of sin, forbids likewise the *inward* desires and emotions of sin in the heart; as, also, that the precept which commands the external acts of duty, requires at the same time the inward feelings and principles of holiness, of which the external acts could only be the fitting expression. 2. That the negative commands include in them the injunction of the contrary duties, and the positive commands the prohibition of the contrary sins; so that in each there is something required as well as forbidden." *Typology, Vol. II., pp.* 95, 96, 97.

In, first, being *commands* of a *personal* God and Moral Governor; in, second, commanding love to that God and Governor; in, third, forbidding the degrading practice of idolatry;

in, fourth, forbidding the degrading sin of profanity; in, fifth, providing for the Sabbath day; in, sixth, providing for rest —mercy to animals, by giving them, also, the rest; in, seventh, inculcating responsibility to God; in, eighth, teaching that all obedience must be from the heart; in, ninth, teaching that God would cut them off from covenant relations with himself, and otherwise punish them; this constitution of Israel rises above the very best known ethics of the heathen world, of any age. And the other commands of this constitution have, as a general fact, been but faintly known among heathen nations, and by them still more faintly practiced. (See Exod. xx.)

Taking the ten commandments—the Constitution of the Old Testament—as its ground and spirit, this chapter might close this work, as having vindicated the perfect holiness of Old Testament Ethics. In all interpretations of Old Testament Ethics, the rules in Chapter II. of this book—see, especially, the latter part of the chapter—bind us to interpret it by its Constitution.

CHAPTER VII.

Ethical Nature and Design of Old Testament Ceremonies.

Fairbairn quotes that great scholar, C. O. Muller: "That this connection of the idea with the sign, when it took place, was natural and necessary to the ancient world; that it occurred involuntarily; and that the essence of the symbol consists in the supposed real connection of the sign with the thing signified, I here assume. Now symbols, in this sense, are evidently coeval with the human race; they result from the union of the soul with the body in man; nature has implanted the feeling for them in the human heart. How is it that we understand what the endless diversities of human expression and gesture signify? How comes it that every physiognomy expresses to us spiritual peculiarities, without any consciousness on our part of the cause? Here experience alone can not be our guide; for without having ever seen a countenance like that of Jupiter Olympus, we should yet, when we saw it, immediately understand its features. An earlier race of mankind, who lived still more in sensible impressions, must have had a still stronger feeling for them. It may be said that all nature wore to them a physiognomical aspect. Now, the worship which represented the feelings of the divine, invisible, external actions was, in its nature, thoroughly symbolical. No one can seriously doubt that prostration in prayer is a symbolical act; for corporeal debasement evidently denotes spiritual sub-

ordination: so evidently, that language can not even describe the spiritual, except by means of a material relation. But it is equally certain that sacrifice also is symbolical; for how would the feeling of acknowledgment, that it is a God who supplies us with food and drink, display itself in action, but by withdrawing a portion of them from the use of man, and setting it apart in honor of the Deity? But precisely because the symbolical has its essence in the idea of actual connection between the sign and the thing signified, was an inlet left for the superstitious error, that something palatable was really offered to the gods—that they tasted it. But it will scarcely do to derive the usage from this superstition; in other words, to assign the intention of raising a savory steam as the original foundation of all sacrifice. It would then be necessary to suppose that, at the ceremony of libation, the wine was poured out on the earth, in order that the gods might lick it up! I have here only brought into view one side of the idea, which formed the basis of sacrifice, and which the other, certainly not less ancient, always accompanied—namely, the idea of atonement by sacrifice; which was from the earliest times expressed in numberless usages and legends, and which could only spring from the strongest and most intense religious feeling: 'We are deserving of death; we offer as a substitute the blood of the animal.'"—*Muller's Introd. to Scientific System of Mythology, p.* 196, as quoted by Fairbairn in *Typology of Scripture, Vol. II., pp.* 197, 198. Referring to the view of Bahr, whose testimony is not liable to suspicion on the grounds of being evangelical, Fairbairn says: "And it is justly inferred by Bahr, ... to the ceremonial part of the law of Moses, that the outward observances of worship it imposed could not possibly be in themselves an end; that they must have been intended to be only an image and representation of internal and spiritual relations; and that the command,

'Not to make any likeness or graven image,' is of itself incontestible proof of the symbolical character of the Mosaic religion."—*Bahr's Symbolik, Vol. I., p.* 14; *Fairbairn's Typology, Vol. II., p.* 93. See Hebrews, where this is taught and where much of the typology of the Old Testament is explained.

Sign teaching is not peculiar to religion; but of things, in general, it stands a teacher. The soldier who pours out his heart's blood upon the gory field for the flag that floats above him, illustrates how symbols teach and hold the heart. "It is difficult to exhibit greater things without the use of patterns."—*Guest in Statesman of Plato.* "As hieroglyphics come before letters, so parables came before arguments. And even now, if any one wish to let new light on any subject into men's minds, and that without offense or harshness, he must still go the same way, and call in the aid of similitudes."—*Lord Bacon's Works, Vol. XIII., p.* 80—quoted, on page 115, in *Mad. Ave. Lect.* Milton says:

> "What if earth
> Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
> Each to the other like, more than on earth is thought?"

And another expresses it:

> "From everything our Savior saw,
> Lessons of wisdom he would draw;
> The clouds, the colors in the sky;
> The gentle breeze that whispers by;
> The fields, all white with waving corn;
> The lilies that the vale adorn;
> The reed that trembles in the wind;
> The tree where none its fruit can find;
> The sliding sand, the flinty rock,
> That bears unmoved the tempest's shock;
> The thorns that on the earth abound;
> The tender grass that clothes the ground;

The little birds that fly in air;
The sheep that need the shepherd's care;
The pearls that deep in ocean lie;
The gold that charms the miser's eye;
All from his lips some truth proclaim,
Or learn to tell their Maker's name."

Symbols of the Old Testament were ordained to teach especial truths. The limit of this book permits only a running notice of the holy significance of the typology of the Old Testament. In Bible dictionaries, commentaries, etc., the reader will see for himself illustrations of the moral significance of Old Testament ceremonies. *Fairbairn's Typology* is the most thorough and reliable work, outside of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on Scripture typology.

The bloody offerings taught that sin is so heinous that we have forfeited our spiritual life, and that we, without satisfaction for our sins by the death of Christ, are cut off forever from all approach to and favor of God. The high priest was typical of Jesus, who is the real High Priest, through whose intercession sinful man must come to the holy God. The other priests represented the believer, offering his heart's sacrifices—worship—to God, through the great High Priest. The fleshly purifications of these priests represented the spiritual purity of the great High Priest, and the spiritual purity with which each believer must come to the holy God. The judgments of God on them for disregarding these symbols represent the certainty of judgment upon all who are not purified, saved, worship through Jesus Christ—the certainty of damnation upon iniquity. "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and *every transgression and disobedience* received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?"—Heb. ii. 2, 3.

The God of the Old Testament being holy, his worship

requiring holiness of the worshiper, all obscene rites—which characterized the worship of Ashtaroth, Bacchus, or the cruel worship of Moloch or Juggernaut, etc. (see pages 29–32 of this book)—were prohibited under pain of death. Read Exod. xxiii. 24; Lev. xviii. 30, especially verses 24–27, where the iniquities of the heathen are specifically referred to; 2 Kings xvii. 15–18; Deut. xviii. 9–14; xxxii. 15–17; 2 Kings, whole of xxi.; Deut. xx. 17, 18; Ezra ix. 10–15; 2 Chron. xxviii. 1–5; xxxiii. 5–20; Ps. cvi. 34–40. The reader is earnestly urged to stop, turn to, read and carefully compare these Scriptures. Even the ablest infidel scholars no longer deny that the Old Testament is generally reliable as a historical work; and here we have the history of the holiness of Jehovah's demands and worship compared with heathenism, of not only then, but, as all history proves, of all ages. See Rom. i. 16–32. So truly does Rom. iii. picture heathen nations, in general, that some of our missionaries have been charged by heathen, in whose hands they have placed Romans, with having written the account from what they saw among them as missionaries! Such able scholars, but heterodox in doctrine, as Bahr, have incontestably proved the dissimilarity, in all *essential* respects, of Jewish and heathen religious ceremonies; so have Fairbairn, *et al.*

The holy significancy of Old Testament ceremonies not only consisted essentially of such ceremonies as were adapted to educate the people to the realization of the necessity of "the better life," but the state of heart necessary to their acceptance in this worship united to inculcate the same holiness of spirit. To offer sacrifices, etc., without repentance—to continue their sin, only rendered the sacrifices a "stench" in the nostrils of Jehovah. Hence, the spiritual penitent felt: "For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt-offering"—*i. e*, when unaccompanied with

repentance. "The sacrifices of God are a *broken spirit:* a broken and a contrite *heart*, O God, thou wilt not despise." "*Then*"—alluding to restoration upon the condition of such a spirit—he says, "shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering and whole burnt-offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar."—Ps. li. 16–19; xl. 6; 1 Sam. iii. 14; xv. 22; Prov. xv. 8; xxi. 3; Hosea viii. 13; xii. 11; Isa. i. 11–20; Jer. vi. 15–35, etc. To support a theory, the school of Prof. Robertson Smith concludes from these Scriptures that they absolutely condemn sacrifices, in whatever spirit they were offered. But, in view of their obvious meaning, that they are not accepted without the moral spirit of which they were but the external part or expression; in view of their being regarded, by the same writers who thus condemn them, as of divine obligation and acceptable to God when offered in the right spirit—see 1 Sam. i. 24–28; ii. 13, 19, 27, 28; iii. 1; vii. 9, 10; 1 Kings viii. 5; 1 Chron. xxix. 17–21; 2 Chron. v. 6–14; Nehemiah, whole of chapter ix., and x. 35–39; Ps. cxviii. 27; li. 19; in view of condemnation of abuses, being an implied recognition of the legitimacy of the thing abused—saying nothing of the fact of these sacrifices being recognized in that part of the Pentateuch which this school acknowledges to belong to the time of Moses ("Davidson following Bleek chiefly, specifies more than twenty chapters of Numbers which must have come from Moses with very slight change, among which the passage of Exod. xxv. 31 was probably written down by him in its present state."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. III., pp.* 24, 25; and Robertson Smith, unwittingly, fatally concedes: "The book of Deuteronomy . . . . reproduces almost every precept of the older code, with or without modification."—*Old Test. in Jewish Ch., p.* 65—in *Seaside Library*); in view of all this, such criticism can be but regarded as *learned trifling.* And, when

I say "learned trifling," I do not mention the certain fact which Dr. Stebbins mentions, which alone leaves the fabric of that school,

> "Like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Which . . . . shall dissolve
> And leave not a rack behind:"

"*There is not a particle of reliable evidence, either external or internal, that a single law recorded in the Pentateuch was the work of the period subsequent to Moses.*"—*A Study of the Pentateuch, p.* 221. Pardon this digression; for the nature of such criticism hardly permits an avoidance of this digression in this connection.

To return to the moral disposition of the offerer of the sacrifices as evincing the purity of Old Testament Ethics, I will close this point by the unimpeachable statement of one of Germany greatest scholars: "There can not be produced out of the whole Old Testament one single passage in which the notion that sacrifices of themselves, and apart from the state of mind of the offerers, are well pleasing to God."—*Hengstenberg's Introd. to Ps. xxxii.*—quoted by Fairbairn. "What is called the ceremonial law was, therefore, in its more immediate and primary aspect, an exhibition by means of symbolical rites and institutions of the righteousness of the decalogue, and a discipline through which the heart might be brought into conformity to the righteousness itself."—*Fairbairn's Typology of Scripture, Vol. II., p.* 157. I may here mention one illustration by a great German scholar, Lange: "Obedience as spiritual bearing is the first duty of priests. Next the hand, as symbolizing human activity, is especially consecrated by being sprinkled with the blood; finally, the great toe of the right foot, as symbolizing the walk of life in general."—Quoted on page 56, of *Samuel Ives Curtiss' Ingersoll and Moses.* In the ceremonial of the Old Testament, then, we have the moral purity of its ethics.

CHAPTER VIII.

Some of the Miscellaneous Hebrew Laws, relating to Ethics.

1. Laws relating to charity.

a. The extreme part of the harvest-fields was left unharvested for the poor. "And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of the field: . . . . thou shalt leave them for the poor."—Lev. xix. 9. The Hebrew for 'corners'— פְּאָה —*peah*—means the extreme side or quarter of the field."—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* In our version, it is rendered side in nearly fifty instances.

b. The gleanings of the field were left for the poor. "Neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them for the poor."—Lev. xix. 9, 10; Deut. xxiv. 21. This gleaning for the poor "was of the fruit-trees as well as of the corn-fields."—Deut. xxiv. 21. From Ruth ii. 6, 8, 9, etc., we learn that the poor often lived well of this gleaning. Hence the proverb: "Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim better than the *vintage* of Abi-ezer." Judges viii. 2. See Isa. xvii. 5, 6; Jer. xlix. 9; Micah vii. 1.

c. A forgotten sheaf must be left in the field for the gleaners. "When thou cuttest down thy harvest in thy field and hast forgotten a sheaf, thou shalt not turn again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow."—Deut. xxiv. 19. This included either harvest or

fruits forgotten. Read from the nineteenth to the twenty-first verse.

d. Permission to eat when passing through a vineyard or field. "When thou comest into thy neighbor's vineyard, then thou mayest eat grapes at thine own pleasure." Read Deut. xxiii. 24, 25. Lest they should wrong their neighbor by taking some with them, the law said, "Thou shalt not put any in thy vessel," etc.

e. Not permitted to keep "the pledge" of the poor over night. "The practice of taking pledges for the payment of debts, immemorial throughout the East (Job xxii. 6; xxiv. 3, 9; for the present age, see *Land and Book*), was regulated by the Mosaic law." "And if any man be a poor man, thou shalt not sleep with his pledge. In any case, thou shalt deliver him the pledge again when the sun goeth down."—Deut. xxiv. 12, 13. This law was about equivalent to a prohibition of taking a very poor man's pledge.

f. Not permitted to enter a man's house to "fetch his pledge." "The man to whom thou dost lend shall bring out the pledge." —Deut. xxiv. 10, 11. This law, by forbidding the creditor to enter his neighbor's house, made him respect the rights and privacy of his neighbor; at the same time, by making his neighbor bring out the pledge, it taught his neighbor to respect the rights of his creditor.

g. "No man shall take the nether or upper mill-stone to pledge: for he taketh a man's life to pledge."—Deut. xxiv. 6. In the East, each one had a small hand-mill, upon which he was daily dependent to grind meal to fill the mouths of his wife and little ones and himself. That could not be taken for debt; for such "taketh a man's life to pledge."

h. Thou shalt not "take the widow's raiment to pledge." —Deut. xxiv. 17.

i. The outer garment could not be kept over night as a

pledge. (Deut. xxiv. 13; Exod. xxii. 26.) This was a sort of coarse blanket on which they were dependent for a bed at night. Concerning some of these pledges—the regulations—which the people by times and manners then understood, Clarke says: "The opinion of the rabbins is, that whatever a man needed for the support of life, he had the use of it when absolutely necessary, though it was pledged. It is very likely that the pledge was restored by *night* only, and that he who pledged it brought it back to his creditor next morning." —*Commentary on Exod. xxii.* 26. While I think Clarke makes too wide an application of this law in connection with some of these pledges, it seems worthy of consideration.

j. They were forbidden to take usury of the poor. The Hebrew נָשָׁה—*nashah*, נֶשֶׁךְ—*nashak*—rendered "usury," primarily signify (*a*) "to bear burden," (*b*) "to bite," as a serpent. As it is very difficult for a *poor* man to pay borrowed money, interest added to it is like a crushing burden, a serpent's bite—it cripples him in all his financial interests. The Lord, therefore, forbade usury of the poor. See Exod. xxii. 25–27; Lev. xxv. 35–37; Neh. vii. 8; Ps. xv. 5. They were commanded to help the poor, by loaning without interest. "And if thy brother be waxen poor, and his hand faileth (marginal rendering, which is the Hebrew meaning) with thee; thou shalt then relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger, and a sojourner."—Lev. xxv. 35, 36.

k. Every third year the tenth of all their increase had to be given to the poor. (Deut. xxiv. 28, 29.)

l. From the produce of the land in sabbatical years, the poor were to have their portion. (Lev. xxv. 6; Exod. xxiii. 11.)

m. Every jubilee year those who lost their lands for debt had them returned to them. (Lev. xxv. 25–28.)

n. The poor were to partake of all the entertainments at the feasts of weeks and the feasts of tabernacles; also, of the passover. (Exod. xxiii. 14; xxxiii. 34; Deut. xvi. 11, 14; Neh. viii. 10.) The feast of weeks or Pentecost continued one day, in the spring; the feast of tabernacles continued seven days, in autumn, followed by a day of holy convocation. These feasts brought the rich and the poor together. Thus they cultivated a oneness of sympathy and interest, and kept the people on an equality. Under this law there could be no prejudices, isolations and inequalities between the rich and the poor, as there are in other nations and in our own. Among heathen we have the contrary. For instance, Confucius says: "Have no friends not equal to yourself."—*Confucius, by Legge, p.* 119.

o. Permanent bondage for debt, as in other nations, forbidden. (Deut. xv. 12–15; Lev. xxv. 39–42, 47–54.)

p. They were not permitted to defraud their hired servants of their wages. Such was the Lord's regard for the poor that they had to be paid their wages at the close of the day. (Lev. xix. 13.)

I have now called attention to sixteen provisions for the poor in the laws of Moses. They are of great variety and of perfect adaptation to the condition of the poor. They manifest the deepest and most tender spirit of humanity. No other nation—not even of modern times has ever made so ample, tender and wise provisions for the wants of the poor, and for the equality and the oneness of the rich and the poor. The beauty of these laws not only appears in their meeting these necessities, but in their cultivation of the *spirit* of charity and universal brotherhood. The reader will notice that they were for the stranger, too. Hence, charity became a fundamental article in the Jewish religion. Beautiful is that picture of the righteous man in the 112th Psalm: "He hath

dispersed, he hath given to the poor; *his* righteousness endureth *forever.*" Such was the influence of these laws that, in our Savior's time, the Pharisees believed charity would cover all their sins. "Alms-giving rose to the dignity of a system, and the virtue that showeth mercy and lendeth became the leading idea of righteousness. . . . . It was mentioned as a marked excellence of a certain predecessor of Hillel, ... that his door opened towards the street and that the poor found with him the welcome of children."—*The Apocrypha, by Bissell, pp.* 11, 29; Luke xix. 8; Matt. vi. 1–4. "In the women's court in the temple there were thirteen receptacles for voluntary offerings for the poor (Mark xii. 41), one of which was devoted to alms for education of poor children. Before the captivity, there was no trace of permission of mendicancy. . . . After the captivity, . . . a definite system of alms-giving was introduced, and even enforced under penalties. The collections were two kinds: (1) Of money for the poor of the city only, made by two collectors, received in a chest or box in the synagogue on the Sabbath, and distributed by the three every evening. Special collections and distributions were also made on fast-days."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. I., p.* 71.

2. Hebrew laws of justice.

a. The man who disabled another in a fight had to pay him for all the loss of his time and expenses while disabled. (Exod. xxi. 18, 19.)

b. "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death."—Exod. xxi. 12. This refers to intentional or malicious killing. "The practice of inflicting capital punishment . . . . is thus justified by that great and good man, Sir Matthew Hale: 'When offenses grow enormous, frequent and dangerous to a kingdom and State, destructive or highly

pernicious to civil society, and to the great insecurity of the kingdom and its inhabitants, severe punishment, and even death itself, is necessary to be annexed to laws, in many cases, by the prudence of lawgivers.'"—*Ch. Blackstone., Vol. II., b.* 4, *sec.* 9. In the New Testament, (*a*) in recognizing the purity of Old Testament morals; (*b*) in recognizing the use of the sword—this Old Testament law is emphasized. (Luke xxii. 36; Rom. xiii. 4.) Neither life nor liberty can be taken from any man, save as God, to whom both belong, has delegated the right to do so to human government. This he has done. (Rom. xiii. 1–7.)

c. "If a thief be found breaking up (in), and be smitten that he die, there shall no blood be shed for him."—Exod. xxii. 3. The man who will break into a house when all nature is in repose, and the owner of the house disarmed, is justly slain.

d. But "if the sun be risen upon him, there shall be blood shed for him."—Exod. xxii. 3. In such case, the owner could save his property and life without killing the thief. So the law reads, "For he should make full restitution: if he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft."—Verse 3.

e. Feticide was punished with death. (Exod. xxi. *22, 23.)* It was death, inasmuch as it is a more heinous crime than the murder of one who can defend himself. This law teaches that feticide is a *crime*, that it is *murder.* It impliedly teaches that it matters not *how, or by whom, committed,* God will require the one who commits it to answer for the *vilest murder.* The lesson of this law needs to now be preached. The Old School Presbyterian Church well condemns this crime: "This Assembly regards the destruction by parents of their offspring before birth with abhorrence; as a crime against God and nature; and, as the frequency of such murders can no longer be concealed, we hereby warn those who are guilty of this

crime that, except they repent, they can not inherit eternal life."—*Extract from Minutes*, May, 1869. Bishop Coxe says: "I warn you against the blood guiltiness of infanticide. If there be a special damnation for those who shed innocent blood, what must be the portion of those who have no mercy upon their own flesh."—*Bishop Coxe's Pastoral Letter*, 1869. In several of our States the laws are severe against this murder.

f. If the woman and child were only injured, the husband pronounced the penalty on the man who caused the hurt. (Exod. xxi. 22, 23.) The penalty was confirmed by the "judges." The injured husband was justly permitted to pronounce the penalty, under limitation of the law. But our laws, instead of giving the injured husband justice against any man who insults the companion of his life, by a trivial sentence only mock him.

g. "If an ox gore a man or a woman, that they die, then the ox shall surely be stoned, and his flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit."—Exod. xxi. 28. In this case the owner was not so much to blame, and lost only his ox. To increase the regard for the sacredness of human life, this ox was stoned to death, and his flesh pronounced "unclean" or unfit to eat. On the minds of so barbarous a people as the Jews then were, this was an impressive lesson.

h. "But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death." —Exod. xxi. 29. In this case the owner was justly put to death because he disregarded the law, the warning and the sacredness of human life. His keeping such an ox, under these conditions, made him responsible for what the ox did. As there was a difference between this and direct murder, the

man might redeem his life. (Verses 30, 31.) Besides, he lost his ox (bull).

i. "If the ox shall push a man-servant or a maid-servant; he shall give unto their master thirty pieces of silver, and the ox shall be stoned."—Exod. xxi. 32. The people, valuing a servant very highly, to lay as a penalty upon the owner of the bull, the price of the slave and the loss of his bull, was sufficient. To have enforced a severer penalty, owing to the barbarous and rebellious nature of the people, may have been impracticable—if necessary. The death of the ox being required in the case of the servant as well as in the case of others, taught the equal sacredness of the servant's life. To as barbarous a people as they were, considering that a servant's life among heathen nations has ever been of little sacredness, this law was exceedingly severe and salutary.

j. "If a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish; he shall let him go free for his eye's sake. And if he smite out his man-servant's tooth, or his maid-servant's tooth; he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake."—Exod. xxi. 26, 27. What other nation, ancient or modern, so protected their servants that such ill-treatment resulted in the master's loss of his slave? Of course, there have been exceptions to the ill-treatment of slaves. But here is the universal *law* for one of the greatest nations of history. Lecky says: "In the later days of the republic (of Rome), and during the empire, the sufferings of slaves were such that it is impossible to read them without a shudder. The full ferocity of the national character was directed against them." —*Lecky's Hist. of Rationalism, Vol. II., p.* 226. (See the section of this book on Hebrew slavery.)

k. If a man's ox fell into the pit, left open by his neighbor, the neighbor "shall make it good."—Exod. xxi. 34.

l. But it was his to make of it what he could, as he paid its value (verse 34).

m. "If one man's ox hurt another's, that he die; then they shall sell the live ox, and divide the money of it; and the dead ox also shall they divide."—Exod. xxi. 35. As the owner was somewhat justly responsible for keeping so dangerous an ox, he had to lose about half its value.

n. "Or if it be known that the ox hath used (*i. e.*, a *notorious* case) to push in time past, and the owner hath not kept him in; he shall surely pay ox for ox; and the dead shall be his own."—Exod. xxi. 36. Notice how equally just these laws are. While restoring to the owner of the killed ox its value, it does not give him more than that, in that it leaves whatever can be got out of the sale of the dead ox to the one who pays the loss.

o. "If a man shall steal an ox, or a sheep, and kill it, or sell it; he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep."—Exod. xxii. 1. This law punished the thief, paid the owner for his loss, provided the loss of a *favorite* animal.

p. "If the theft be certainly found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep; he shall restore double."—Exod. xxii. 4. In case of restoration, the man suffered little or no loss by the theft. Hence, the thief was punished by the loss of one of his own animals; or, if he had none of his own, was sold for debt.

q. For other losses which any one had inflicted on his neighbor he had to make "restitution." (Exod. xxii. 5, 6, 9.) Space does not permit me to take up all the laws of this class and show their wisdom and justice.

r. "Thou shalt not raise a false report."—Exod. xxiii. 1.

s. "Put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness."—Exod. xxiii. 1.

t. "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil"—to be "popular."—Exod. xxiii. 2.

u. "Neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment."—Exod. xxiii. 2. No taking sides in court to be with "popular" sentiment and with the rich.

v. Neither permitted to let sympathy for the poor prevent them from receiving the infliction of justice at the hand of the law. (Exod. xxiii. 3, 6; Lev. xix. 15.) But Confucius taught the grossest dishonesty. He says: "The father conceals the misconduct of the son, and the son conceals the misconduct of the father. Uprightness is to be found in this." —*Confucius' Works, p.* 205.

w. Judges forbidden to take gifts, lest it "blindeth the wise."—Exod. xxiii. 8.

x. Forbidden to disrespect civil authority, by reviling judges and rulers. (Exod. xxii. 28.*)

y. "Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer."—Lev. xix. 16.

z. "Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumbling-block before the blind."—Lev. xix. 14. This means, "You shall not make sport of the deaf by cursing him, as if he could hear you; you shall not put a stumbling-block in the way of the blind, as if he could see. No "fun" over men's "misfortunes."

aa. Restore straying property to its owner, by taking it back "again to thy brother."—Deut. xxii. 1.

---

*"אֱלֹהִים—*elohim* and Θεοί—*theoi*—plural in Hebrew and Greek, in a few Scriptures are applied to judges, on the ground of their official dignity as the representatives of God in civil government. See and compare Rom. xiii. 1–6; Exod. xxii. 28; Psa. lxxxii. 6; John x. 34."—*Tholuck on John x. 34.* Adam Clarke's attempt to apply *elohim* to God, in Exod. xxii. 28, is absurd; and, in attempting to bolster up this interpretation, by making the Hebrew כ there render it "like gods" is equally futile, since כ is not there joined to אֱלֹהִים.

bb. But if the one meeting the straying property did not know whose it was, "it shall be with thee until thy brother seek after it, and thou shalt restore it to him again."—Deut. xxii. 2. Thus the stray was prevented from straying off where its owner might never, or with great difficulty and expense, find it. The Jews were not permitted to live on the murderer Cain's selfish policy, the one on which we so generally live.

cc. Perfect justice in measures and weights a law."—Deut. xxv. 13–15.

I have now noticed thirty representative laws on justice. They display perfect wisdom, justice and humanity. They are but a part of the laws of Hebrew justice. I refer the reader to Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*, *b.* 4, *ch.* 8, for a fuller notice of these laws. This book admits of no more room for them. Josephus, though not always correct in his *Antiquities*, is generally a reliable expositor.

3. Jewish courts of justice and trials.*

a. "As Moses directed, judges and scribes were appointed for every city, with jurisdiction over the surrounding villages. Cases of great importance, and appeals, were carried to the civil ruler, or to the high priest. (Deut. xvi. 18; xvii. 8, 9.)"

b. "The court consisted of a judge or judges, and, at least in later times, of a scribe who wrote down the sentence and the particulars of the trial or cause. Before them stood the accused, the accuser, and the witnesses. Two witnesses were necessary to establish any charge, and they were examined separately, in the presence of the accused. (Numb. xxxv. 30; Deut. xvii. 6; Matt. xxvi. 60.)"—*Hist. of Palestine, by Kitto, pp.* 122, 123.

*German scholars use "Hebrew" to indicate the period of Israel previous to close of Old Testament prophecy, and the "Jewish" the period after that. In this work there is no distinction in the use of the two words.

c. The punishment, or its equivalent, which the false witness endeavored to swear upon another, he had to suffer himself. (Deut. xix. 6–19; Lev. v. 1.)

d. The witnesses must "be the first" to put hands upon the condemned to put him to death. (Deut. xiii. 9; xvii. 7.) This law would make a witness give his testimony very carefully; for few men can help shrinking from such a deed.

e. The accused—not being condemned—was permitted to testify in his own behalf. (Exod. xxii. 11; Numb. v. 19–22; 1 Kings viii. 31.)

f. The judges must be the wisest and best of men. (Exod. xviii. 21.)

g. They were to be strictly impartial. (Exod. xxiii. 6–9.)

h. All important matters, and matters they could not settle among themselves, must come before these judges. Men were not permitted to take the laws into their own hands. (Deut. xvi. 18; xvii. 8, 9.)

4. Jewish punishments.

a. These punishments were generally life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, according to the nature of the crime. (Exod. xxi. 23, 25.)

b. In other cases, indemnification or restitution and indemnification made by the offender. (Exod. xxi. 30; xxii. 1–6.)

c. Corporal punishments. (Deut. xxv. 2, 3.)

d. Excommunications. (Numb. xv. 30, 31.) As this involved many privations, it was much feared.

e. Rendering the crime exceedingly odious by posthumous punishments. (Numb. xxv. 4, 5; Deut. xxi. 22, 23; Lev. xx. 14; xxi. 9; Joshua vii. 15, 25, 26; 2 Sam. xviii. 17.) This hanging, burning, and raising a heap of stones over the body were very impressive and restraining.

Compare the following from Prof. Monier Williams' *Indian*

Wisdom—Hindoo—that glorious (?) Veda land—as found in Mozely's *Ruling Ideas of Early Ages—p.* 186: "The three most conspicuous features of Manus' penal laws are exactly those which mark the earliest forms of criminal legislation. . . . . 'With whatever member of the body a low-born man may injure a superior, the very member of his must be mutilated. A once-born man, insulting twice-born men with abusive language, must have his tongue cut out. Should he mention their name and caste with insulting expressions, as Hallo, there! Yaj na datta, vilest Brahmans, a red-hot iron spike, ten fingers long, is to be thrust into his mouth. Should he, through arrogance, attempt to instruct a Brahman in his duty, the king is to have boiling oil poured into his mouth and ears. Thieves are to have their hands cut off, and then to be impaled on a sharp stake. A goldsmith detected in committing frauds is to have his body cut in pieces with a razor.' It will be observed that a graduated scale is prescribed, according to the rank of the offender and the class to which he belongs: Thus, 'a king must never kill a Brahman, though he may be found guilty of all possible crimes; let him expel him from the kingdom unharmed in body, and intact in all his property. There is no greater injustice on earth than the killing of a Brahman. The king, therefore, must not harbor a thought about putting him to death. A Kshatriya insulting a Brahman must be fined one hundred panas; a Vaisya doing the same must pay one hundred and fifty or two hundred panas; a Sudra doing the same must receive corporal punishment.'" The reader will observe the cruelty, the vindictiveness, the partiality, the lack of wisdom in these laws, and their incomparable inferiority to the Old Testament laws. Yet infidels tell the people of the "barbarity," etc., of the Old Testament and of the "beauty" of Hindoo, etc., laws!

5. Hebrew cities of refuge.

With the people of that age it was the custom when a person was slain for his nearest relative to take upon him the office of avenger, and rest not till he had slain the homicide. A practice so liable to abuse and endless feuds could not be endured in any well-organized community. "The law, therefore, provided for the mitigation of its evils," as the people were not sufficiently educated for its abolishment. "Six cities, in different parts of the country, were appointed as cities of refuge, to any of which the unintentional manslayer might hasten; and when he had reached it, and while he remained in it, he was safe from the avenger." "The elders of the city of refuge were to hear his case and protect him till he could be tried before the authorities of his own city. If the act was then decided to have been involuntary, he was taken back to the city of refuge, round which an area of 2,000 cubits was assigned as the limit of his protection, and was to remain there in safety till the death of the high priest for the time being. Beyond the city of refuge the revenger might slay him; but after the high priest's death, he might return to his home with impunity. The altar at first was used and continued in use with the cities of refuge." (Numb. xxxv. 25, 28; Joshua xx. 4, 6; Exod. xxi. 14; 1 Kings ii. 28–34; 2 Kings xi. 15.) To facilitate the slayer's flight, the roads to the cities of refuge were kept in the best condition. (Deut. xix. 3.) Of course, if the judge condemned the manslayer, he was executed; and the avenger was the executioner. (Numb. xxxv. 9–34.) Prof. Robertson Smith's attempt to prove, by the use of the altar as a "refuge," that the provision for "cities of refuge" in Deut. xix. was after the time of David, and that Deuteronomy was written, therefore, after David's time, is wholly arbitrary. Facts prove

it false; for, surely, Joshua xx. was provided for before David's time. Supposing a late date for Joshua, that does not make the evidently early provision of cities of refuge in Joshua xx. of late provision. But, there is not a shadow of *reason* for assigning either Deuteronomy or Joshua to a later date than the old one. These provisions rendered justice, gave time for cool judgment of the avenger, protected the innocent homicide's life, at the same time made him more careful, etc. An infidel publication finds fault with these provisions, by claiming that the avenger was permitted to slay the manslayer, if he could overtake him before he reached the refuge. The law says no such thing. On the contrary, these provisions were to prevent this very thing. See Numb. xxxv. 15; Deut. iv. 42. If the avenger happened—which was improbable, considering the start he had of the avenger—to overtake the manslayer, nothing could have prevented his killing him. But such killing would have subjected the slayer to the severest penalty.

Among the Hindoos and the Germans, a specified sum of money satisfied for accidental or other homicides. "But," as Prof. Mozley remarks, "that such a judicial arrangement as this, though it avoided the blind blood shed of the law of Goel, its striking at the first person that offered, and killing the wrong man, if it so happened, or mistaking his crime, could never have sown the seed of civilized justice. For regular justice, the retributive principle was necessary, and death for death was the only way of meeting murder—the only solid preventive of it. In however rude and uncertain a form, the law of Goel was the true germ of civilized justice, which, sanguinary for the moment, seized hold of the true judicial scope of security for the future. The fine was no help against violence to come; and, as Michaelis observed, 'The poor man has little security for his life against the rich; because the

latter nas the means of reverting retaliation by persuading the poor man's relations, which will seldom be a very difficult matter, to accept of money in lieu of blood.' The fine was an oblique and distorted aim to begin with. But the institution of Goel caught up the first movement of genuine justice and indignation at wrong, gave it its swing, and put the case in its hand. . . . And a law, with such a root of nobility and justice in it, was not unfit for adoption, as a temporary curb upon human nature, till it could admit of a higher discipline by the divine Lawgiver, whose necessary policy, when he gave laws to unenlightened men, was accommodation."—*Ruling Ideas of Early Ages, p.* 211.

"Mahomet endeavored to mitigate this law, which was so dangerous to innocence (the one that Moses' law so well mitigated); but, unfortunately, he began at the wrong end. For, instead of enjoining a previous investigation that an innocent person might not suffer instead of the guilty, he recommended as an act of mercy, pleasing in the sight of God, the acceptance of a pecuniary compensation from the actual murderer, in lieu of revenge.—*Koran, ch.* 2. . . . This strange law, which, in fact, makes the right of retaliation quite ineffectual to the security of a man's life, because it can be compounded for by the payment of money to his kinsmen."—*Michaelis, quoted by Mozley.* Not only this, but Mahomet leaves the rich to buy themselves from the penalty of murder. Let the reader answer, why the "barbarous" book that the Old Testament is represented, by infidels, to be, is so just, wise and humane, while other religions, laws, etc., are the reverse?

6. Jewish political institutions.

Inasmuch as political institutions are so vitally connected with judicial institutions—in fact, as part of them—I here notice the political institutions of the Jews.

a. "The theory of the Hebrew constitution supposed God himself was the King and general Lawgiver and Governor of the nation." It presumed that the prophets, priests—especially the high priest—and judges, were the interpreters of his will.

b. Outside of the revealed law, which was their unchangeable rule, the Hebrews made laws for themselves. These laws must not conflict with their revealed laws. "By the constitution, as originally established through Moses, the consent of all the tribes was required to give effect to public measures." As it was impossible to bring a matter before the whole nation at once, they had their representatives. (Numb. i. 16; xvi. 2; Deut. xxix. 10; Joshua xxiii. 2.)

c. Moses and Joshua were only temporary officers. The former organized the nation; the latter established it in Canaan.

d. The kings were God's vice-kings of God. (1 Sam. xxii. 50, 51; Ps. x. 16; xxix. 10; lxxxix. 18; xcviii. 6.)

e. The same laws of right and justice were for both king and subjects. The only difference was in their execution. Inasmuch as the king was above his subjects, the Lord punished him.

In concluding this chapter, let the reader remember that it presents only sufficient of the judicial and political institutions of the Jews to enable the reader to see their matchless wisdom, justice, humanity and righteousness. So perfect are these laws and institutions, that they raised a barbarous people from barbarism into one of the most civilized conditions of the earth. See last chapter of this book. So perfect are these laws and institutions, that there were no prisons, worthy of mention, known among the Jews before the captivity. At that time, they had somewhat departed from their laws. Even then prisons were little needed. It was only

when the Hebrews became so mixed with other nations that they built prisons. But the Canaanites and other nations had prisons from time immemorial. And *we* can not do without them; yea, the *more we become "civilized" and loosened from Bible laws, the more we need prisons!*

CHAPTER IX.

Old Testament Care and Tenderness for Animals.

No good-hearted person can be cruel to animals. The Jew received his animals as the gift of God; as having feelings; and to use only for the best of purposes; and to be well and tenderly cared for.

Wuttke says: "With the exception of the Indians, who adored nature as the revealed divine essence itself, no people has manifested so high a respect for nature as the Israelites; the legislation of the Old Testament surpasses all other systems in a considerate sparing of nature. Domestic animals especially are placed under the sparing protection and care of the law [Prov. xii. 10]; the mouth of the threshing ox is not to be muzzled [Deut. xxv. 4]; on the Sabbath cattle also are given rest [Exod. xx. 10]; in the Sabbatical year both cattle and beasts are to pasture on the fallow lands [Exod. xxiii. 11; Lev. xxv. 6, 7, in the original]; the beast of another that falls under its burden or loses its way is to be helped [Exod. xxiii. 5; Deut. xxii. 1, seq.; compare Matt. xii. 11]. Under the same category (as seething a kid in its mother's milk) falls the prohibition of killing the calf, the kid, the lamb, on the same day with its mother [Lev. xxii. 28]. . . . The touching account of the care of God for the animals at the time of the deluge, is an emphatic illustration of the sparing of animals as it should be exerted by man; God also includes animals in

his covenant with Noah, and he promises to spare them."—*Eth., Vol. II., pp.* 264, 265.

Lecky, a skeptic, says: "That tenderness attached to animals, which is *one* of the most beautiful *features* of Old Testament writings, shows itself, *among other* ways, in the command not to muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn, or to yoke together the ox and the ass. The Jewish law did not confine its care to oxen. The reader will remember the touching provision, 'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its *mother's* milk' (Deut. xiv. 21); and the law forbidding men to take a parent bird that was sitting on its young or on its eggs (Deut. xxii. 6, 7)." —*Lecky's Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., pp.* 172, 173.

Let any one compare these Bible provisions for animals with the cruelties to animals in gladiatorial exhibitions of civilized Greece, Rome, Spain, and our own cruelties, and ask how such laws can be found in a "book of such cruelty" and of such a "cruel author," as the Old Testament is claimed to be!

CHAPTER X.

Old Testament Laws concerning Treatment of Enemies, Heathen or Strangers.

1. "ONE LAW AND ONE MANNER SHALL BE FOR YOU, AND FOR THE STRANGER THAT SOJOURNETH WITH YOU."—Numb. xv. 16. "This law obviously applies to heathen as well as to Hebrews. L. Baur, Stendel and Michaelis,* all skeptics, admit this."—*Sermon on Mount, by Tholuck, p.* 280.

"For the Lord your God is a God of gods, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which *regardeth not persons.* . . . He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and *loveth the stranger*, in giving him food and raiment. Love ye, *therefore*, the stranger."—Deut. x. 18, 19. "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."—Lev. xix. 33, 34, *et seq.* So, "in every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."—Acts x. 35. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."—Lev. xix. 18. By this is especially meant all that are in need. (Luke x. 27–37.) From this it is clear that the ten commandments and the whole Hebrew law governed Hebrews in their relations to other nations as well as to themselves. All were equal before the law. Who will presume to say that the ten commandments

* Some may not regard the "literary school" of German biblical criticism as skeptical. But it was evidently so tinctured with it as to produce rationalism. And Eichorn was trained at the feet of Michaelis.

governed the Jews only in their relations to each other? All these secular and partly moral privileges of the law were the boon of the Gentile stranger. And, by accepting the Hebrew religion, he was welcome to all the religious blessings and privileges of the Hebrews.

2. Hebrew relations to enemies.

Of course, the law did not release any one from his obligations to his enemies. The law unchangeably held all equal.

"If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him."—Exod. xxiii. 4, 5. "From the humane and heavenly maxim, . . . our blessed Lord has formed the following precept: 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use and persecute you' (Matt. v. 44)."—*Adam Clarke's Commentary on Exod. xxiii.* 4, 5. Let any one, who thinks the Old Testament standard of love to enemies low, try to follow out the above precept.

"Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart. . . . . Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."—Lev. xix. 17, 18. We have seen that all men are meant, by the law, as our neighbors.

Some interpret our Savior's words, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil"—to teach that the Old Testament taught private revenge. (Matt. v. 38, 39.) They also so interpret, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I

say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."—Matt. v. 43, 44.

But, *first*, this makes our Savior contradict himself: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, *one jot or one tittle* shall in no wise pass from the law, till *all* be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments—*i. e.*, of Old Testament morals—and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."—Matt. v. 17–19. The reader will please turn to the close of the second chapter of this book and read the rules of interpretation there quoted from Greenleaf, Blackstone and Kent. Such an interpretation makes Jesus say that he would not destroy a shadow of the Old Testament; and then, in a few words after that, destroy its teachings on a great moral point. If the law was not perfect in righteousness, he could not have fulfilled it all; if he destroyed any part of it, that part could not have been perfectly holy.

Second. It makes the great Lawgiver contradict his ethics in the Old Testament by a new ethics of the New Testament.

Third. There is *no such law in the Old Testament* as hatred to enemies and private revenge. The correction of our Savior is not a correction of the Old Testament, but a correction of the traditions and perversions of the Old Testament by the Pharisees and scribes.*

a. "The 'eye for an eye, and tooth for a tooth' law was," says Tholuck, "given to the magistrates in the courts of justice. . . . This command of Moses is based on the *jus*

* See pages 29 and 30 of the *Apocrypha*, by Bissell, for illustrations of these perversions, etc., of Moses' laws.

talionis (το αντιπεπονθὸς)—to *antipeponthos*—(end of justice or justice-of-like punishment) which lies at the foundation of the oldest code of law. This law of civil courts was not, however, a rule to guide the conduct of individuals. They, on the contrary, are forbidden to seek for compensation in so far as passion of revenge is their motive. (Lev. xix. 18; Prov. xxiv. 29; Lam. iii. 27, 30.) 'Say not, I will do to him as he has done to me: I will render to the man according to his work.' 'It is good for a man that he bear the yoke of his youth; that he sit alone, and keep silence, because he hath laid it upon him; . . . . that he give his cheek to him that smiteth him, he is filled full with reproach.' So says the Old Testament. The bad sense in which the command had been applied by the scribes, is to be learned from the contrast in the following passage. It seems that what is there spoken of is private intercourse. The majority of commentators have accordingly explained the false exposition of the scribes, as consisting in this, that they applied in private intercourse a law which was given only for the administration of courts of justice; thus, Luther, Bucer, Piscator, Calov, Tirinus, Bengel, B. Crusius, and others."—*Sermon on the Mount, pp.* 266, 267. Among the others are Maldonatus, Este, a Lapide, Grotius, Episcopius, G. W. Clarke, Adam Clarke, *Comp. Commentary*, Barnes, Stier, Ernesti, Meyer, De Wette—in fact, I know of no commentator who otherwise comments. Here are both infidel and Christian commentators agreed in interpreting our Savior's words to be only a correction of a perversion of the law which made it apply to private conduct.

The words of the law itself are so plain (see Deut. xix. 16–21; Lev. xxiv. 17–22) that it is strange that any one ever misapprehended our Savior's words. What would be thought of an exposition which should authorize private revenge from the laws of our country? Yet such an exposition would be

exactly alike that exposition of the Mosiac law, which makes it authorize private revenge.

b. The "hate thine enemy" law. Says Tholuck: "Now, it is unquestionable that this is a false application of the law. . . . . And, although it is further a very common prejudice that to love one's enemies is a virtue peculiar to the New Testament, still it is certain that the law itself condemned the cherishing of a hostile temper in private intercourse (Lev. xix. 18; Exod. xxiii. 4, 5). . . . . Many sayings of the gnomic lyric and didactic poetry teach us this spirit of love was no 'dead letter, but really penetrated the spirit of godly men.'"—*Idem, p.* 279. Tholuck well says that "hate thine enemy" is a "rabbinical addition." Tholuck here refers to such Old Testament teachings as, "Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thine heart be glad when he stumbleth" (Prov. xxiv. 17); "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; if he be thirsty, give him water to drink" (Prov. xxv. 21). In vindicating himself, Job said, "If I rejoiced in the destruction of him that hateth me, or lifted myself up when evil found him. . . . The stranger did not lodge in the street; but I opened my doors to the traveler." —Job xxxi. 29, 32. When the king asked Elijah if he should smite the Assyrians, who were seeking the destruction of Israel, the prophet replied: "Thou shalt not smite them. . . . Set bread and water before them, that they may eat and drink, and go to their master. And he prepared great provision for them: and when they had eaten and drunk, he sent them away."—2 Kings vi. 21–23.

Tholuck says: "All the more remarkable are the instances of liberality towards the poor among the heathen in foreign lands, which occurred frequently in the latter days of Judaism." —*Sermon on the Mount, p.* 281. Mimonides and Prideaux especially mention this liberality. "According to the law of

Moses, a corner of the field was left for the stranger and the poor of Israel; in this, the latter Jews permitted also the heathen to share. We also read that alms were collected in a special box. 'Let the poor who are not Israelites be fed and clothed equally with Israel, for the sake of the ways of salvation.'"—*Sermon on the Mount, p.* 281. "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian..'—Deut. xxiii. 7.

G. W. Clarke says: "Hate thine enemy was never commanded, but was added by the Jewish teachers."—*Commentary on Matt. v.* 44.

Stier says: "There can be no more mischievous perversion of Scripture or slander on the Old Testament than to make it teach, or to make our Savior's words teach, that it teaches hatred to enemies."—*Words of Jesus, Vol. I., p.* 196. The *Comparative Commentary*, *Bengel's Commentary*, *Adam Clarke's Commentary*, and, so far as I know, all evangelical commentators agree in that the Old Testament enjoins love to our enemies, and that our Savior's words correct only the false exposition and additions of the scribes and Pharisees. Inasmuch as the Old Testament so unequivocally commands, and in other ways teaches, love to enemies, it is equally strange that such an injustice has been done to it as to make it teach the contrary.

The ten commandments ought to be sufficient to correct such interpretations. "We have seen that the command to love one's enemies is not given as an antithesis to the law of Moses, but that it was commanded to the Jewish people, and also practiced by them. . . . . Generally speaking, the standpoint of the ancient world is less elevated than that of the Old Testament law; *ωφελειν μὲντους φιλους, βλαπτειν ςε τουςεχθρους—ophelein men tous philous, bleptein de tous ekthrous* (truly help one's friends, but hinder one's enemies)—was the

maxim even of the wise men of the people. This egotism is very plainly put in some verses of Hesiod, which Plutarch was inclined to consider authentic, on account of their illiberality. In a passage in Plutarch where there is a description of the moral transformation (*de sera num Vind.*, *c.* 22) of an immoral man, it is said, in his praise, that since him there has been no one among the Cilicians who was more useful to his friends or more dangerous to his enemies."—*Tholuck's Sermon on the Mount, pp.* 283, 284. Socrates taught that to do good to one's friends, and evil to one's enemies, is a moral requirement (*Xen. Mem.*, 2, 6, 35); though, indeed, to suffer wrong is better than to do it. The doing evil to one's enemies being, in fact, not a wrong, but a legitimate retaliation. (*Plato's Rep., Vol. I., p.* 335; *Crito, p.* 49.) See *Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 71.

Confucius says: "Recompense injury* with justice, and recompense kindness with kindness."—*Confucius, p.* 217—translated by Legge.

"The precept of love to neighbor is presented even in the Old Testament as a chief duty (Lev. xix. 18), and is expressly intended to non-Israelites (Lev. xix. 34; Deut. x. 19; Micah vi. 8; Zech. vii. 9); what a contrast this forms to the boasted 'humantarianism' of the Greeks, to whom every non-Greek was a rightless barbarian."—*Wuttke's Eth., Vol. II., p.* 255.

* Legge says, as the result of this teaching of Confucius: "Sir John Davis has rightly called attention to this as one of the objectionable principles of Confucius. The bad effects of it are evident even in the present day. Revenge is sweet to the Chinese. . . . They do not like to resign, even to government, the inquisition for blood."—*Confucius, p.* 114.

CHAPTER XI.

The Old Testament and Servants.

1. Heathen or ancient slavery was never instituted or encouraged by the Lord; and, in this sense, is not an Old Testament institution.* This is plain from several considerations:

a. In the garden of Eden there were no slaves and no provision for slavery. The only provision there was a provision of *equality for all.*

b. Before the flood—including about 1,656 years—there is no account of slavery.

c. In beginning the world anew, when they left the ark, there was no provision for slavery. There were only Noah and his family who left the ark and began the world anew; hence, as in Eden, no one to be a slave.

d. Before the time of Abraham there was no slavery. Gen. ix. 25 has been thought to teach the divine origin of slavery. But, "the language is prophetic; anticipating, by a divinely given foresight, the future character and destiny of this line of Ham's posterity. These did not follow as consequences of the curse here pronounced, but were prophetically anticipated by it."—*Genesis, with notes and translation, by T. J.*

* The subject of Jewish and heathen slavery is not intended by the author of this work to refer to slavery in the United States of America. Whatever were the merits of slavery in the United States, it was settled before the author was of age and when he knew nothing of biblical investigation.

Conant, D. D., p. 40. Even if it were otherwise, it could mean no more than that such slavery, like disease—all the ills of life, is one of the curses of sin to the human race—a curse to both slave and master.

In Gen. xix. 15, 16, 30, 12, we learn that though Lot was a judge in Sodom, he had no slaves to save; for none are mentioned, referred or alluded to. At a late day of his life, Abraham had so few servants that they are not mentioned among his possessions. (Gen. xiii. 2.) From Gen. xii. 5 it appears that Abraham got his first servants in Haran, when he was about seventy-five years old.

e. Jewish slavery was an evil that the chosen people, with other evils, learned from other nations. Abraham learned the evil in Haran.

Thus, the *first* 2,083 *years of the Old Testament finds neither slavery nor provision for slavery.* And, when it is found among the chosen, it is found an evil that they contracted from the heathen. It is, therefore, clear that when slavery is found among the Hebrews, it is found not of divine but of heathen origin. He who, in the absence of any account of the divine enactment of slavery, can believe that the last 2,000 years of the Old Testament is a period of divinely originated, or encouraged slavery, in view of the above considerations, must believe so, in disregard of the laws of interpretation quoted in the second chapter of this book. This will further appear in the regulations of slavery.

2. SLAVERY AS REGULATED.—There were some things, our Savior informs us, which were suffered—not originated or authorized—by the Old Testament because of the "hardness" of the people's "hearts." (Matt. xix. 8.) While permitted, they were so regulated as to mitigate much of their evils, educate the people out of, and, finally, do away with them. In this way all civilizations have grown up, and all wise legislators

act. No law can be enforced which is too far in advance of the education of the people. To attempt to enforce a law, so far in advance of the people that they will rebel against it, can only defeat its purpose. "The institution of slavery was recognized, though not established by the Mosaic law, with a view to mitigate its hardships and to secure to every man his ordinary rights. Repugnant as the notion of slavery is to our minds, it is difficult to see how it can be dispensed with in certain phases of society, without, at all events, entailing severer evils than those which it produces."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. IV., p.* 3057.

3. Slavery of Jews.

First. Slavery of Jews was payment of debt and a punishment for theft. (Lev. xxv. 25, 39; Exod. xxii. 3.) The one in debt and unable to pay was permitted to *sell himself* (not be sold as the *Common Version**); in other words, enter into voluntary service to pay his debt. "Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant: but as a hired servant and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee."—Lev. xxv. 39. This was a way to pay just debts, and, at the same time, a light punishment to make people careful how they went into debt. While a servant, his wife and children were with him, were cared for; and when he went out of servitude, he took them with him.† (Lev. xxv. 41.) Considering the laws which provided help for the poor, the one who involved himself into debt was justly obligated to sell himself as a kind of punishment for going into debt. The instances of seizing children for debt were outrages of the law. (2 Kings iv. 1; Neh. v. 5.) They show the hardness of the people's hearts.

*נִמְכַּר—reflexive *niphal*, of *kal* "sell himself." This voluntary hired service, to pay off the debt, is very different from being "sold."

† See exception explained in Chapter XII., under point "9," "*b*."

The thief was sold to work out restitution to the one from whom he had stolen the property, and, at the same time and in the same way, to work out the penalty of the law. (Exod. xxii. 1, 3.) This was something like convict labor among us, except that the one who had suffered the loss received the restitution instead of the State. It is a better law than our own.

Second. A daughter was, in extreme circumstances, sold, with view to her marriage, to the one buying her, or to his son. (Exod. xxi. 7, 8.) If the man dealt "deceitfully* with her"—which law could then no more prevent than now—"then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her to a strange nation he shall have no power." "If he hath betrothed her to his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters"—give her the same dowry that he would give his own daughters. If his son took another wife, he had to give the same attention to her as before, or buy her release, or lose all the money he had given for her, as well as the dowry she took with her. (Exod. xxi. 7–11.) The other phase of the ethical question of this marriage is treated on the Hebrew *marriages* or family.

The Hebrew servants were released by redemption, by the year of jubilee, or by the seventh year, if it came before the jubilee. (Lev. xxv. 40, 41; Exod. xxi. 2–11.) While servants, the law was: "Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor; but shalt fear thy God."—Lev. xxv. 43.† Hebrew slavery

*בָּגַד—*bagad*—means to act "covertly, deceitfully;" is so used in Job vi. 15. He deceived her by promising to make her his real—only—wife.

† These regulations or restrictions upon this evil, which, because of the rude moral ideas then prevalent, could not then be wholly removed, show that the slavery, then prevailing, was very barbarous—to require such restrictions; and so the history of slavery among heathen nations proves it to have been.

was hardly more than our servants or "hired help." In fact, it was not slavery.

4. SLAVERY OF FOREIGNERS.—"The majority of slaves who were not Hebrews were war captives, either of the Canaanites who had survived the general extermination of the race under Joshua, or such as were conquered from the surrounding nations. (Numb. xxxi. 26–46; Lev. xxv. 44, 45.) Besides these, some were obtained by purchase from foreign slave-dealers (Lev. xxv. 44, 45); and others may have been resident foreigners, who were reduced to this state either by poverty or crime."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. IV., p.* 3060.

First. By making them slaves, their lives were saved in war. With Jews and others, only the fact that their captives could be made slaves saved them from death at the hands of their bloody captors.—*Introd. Study of Roman Law, by Hadley, p.* 110.

Second. The murder of a slave was death to the murderer —the same as murdering a free man. (Lev. xxiv. 17, 22; Exod. xxi. 20, with Gen. ix. 6.)

It has been objected that the master not being punished in case the servant lived "a day or two" after he was smitten (verse 21), is wrong. But, when we bear in mind that the master did not intend to kill the slave; that he might, in that time, have died from another cause; and that the master lost what he regarded a *valuable piece of property*, the force of the objection vanishes. Remember that the law gives the master "the benefit of the doubt" as to his dying from being smitten; and that the law demanded the death of the master for killing his slave as well as for killing any one. If the master was not executed after the slave lived "a day or two" because—as the infidel claims—he was a slave, why was he executed in case of his immediate death?

Third. The law freed any servant whose master had knocked out his tooth or eye. (Exod. xxi. 26, 27.)

Fourth. The slave was treated much better than many hired servants or "hands" of our own time; for he had one day in seven as his own. (Exod. xx. 10.) Also, he had a good time and rest in the Hebrew festivals. (Exod. xii. 44; Deut. xii. 18; xvi. 11, 14.

Fifth. Whoever let his ox kill another's servant had to pay him the price of the servant; and, to impress all with the sacredness of human life, have the ox stoned to death. (Exod. xxi. 32.) To as barbarous a people as the Jews then were, this penalty opened their eyes to the sacredness of a slave's life. If any farther penalty was needed, it was not practical, for the same cause that the immediate abolition of slaves was not practical.

Sixth. Hebrew slaves were very highly honored and well treated in all things. They were often made rulers of the house, tutors of their master's sons—showing that they had great educational privileges; and, also, tenants on large estates. (Gen. xv. 2; xxiv. 2; Prov. xvii. 2; xxix. 19, 21.) (The boring the ear, mentioned in Exod. xxi. 2–6, has reference to only a Hebrew servant. It was done because the wife and the family were Canaanites, and, as such, could not "go out" as the Hebrews. This will be noticed under the family or the marriage.) So well were Hebrew slaves treated, that there is but one instance of a time of runaway slaves mentioned in all Hebrew history; that—in 1 Sam. xxv. 10—is the authority of only wicked Nabal.

5. ADAPTATION OF THE LAWS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR ABOLISHING SLAVERY.

a. The fact of there being neither slaves nor provision for slavery in the first 2,000 years of Jewish history.

b. In slavery having no place in Eden.

c. In its having no place as they went out of the ark.

d. In its origin being heathen.

e. In that the laws were the same which governed and regulated all, governed and regulated the master in his treatment of his slaves.

f. In the Jews being continually reminded that they had been slaves of the Egyptians. (Lev. xxv. 52–55.)

g. Man-stealing—for slavery—was death to the man-stealer. (Deut. xxiv. 7.) No other theft was death to the thief. Thus, slavery received a fatal stab.

h. According to the genesis of men, "all were born—created—free and equal." Thus God created men. Whoever held slaves clearly violated this divine order.

i. According to Genesis, God made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the earth—universal brotherhood. No credit to man to enslave his brother.

j. According to Genesis, all were created in the image of God. No credit to man to enslave the image of his Creator.

k. All men were regarded our neighbors, calling for help in time of need. Not very much encouragement to hold in slavery those whom God calls on us to help as neighbors.

l. Every seven years, or the year of jubilee, freed all Hebrew servants. (Exod. xxi. 2; Lev. xxv. 40, 41.) Gentile slaves were not freed, because the "hardness of the hearts" of the Jews would not admit of the enforcement of a law freeing them, without entailing greater evils. But the freeing of Jewish slaves with "*a*," "*b*," "*c*," "*d*," "*e*," "*f*," "*g*," "*h*," "*i*," "*j*," "*k*," before them, prepared their minds for the final abolition of all slaves. Other things are in the Old Testament which helped to abolish slavery; but these eleven, which I have pointed out, are sufficient to show the Old Testament an anti-slavery book. Any reasonable man can readily see that no property could be secure with such restrictions

and reflections upon holding it. These restrictions and reflections upon Jewish slavery, instead of its absolute prohibition, stand as evidence of the pre-eminent wisdom and benevolence of the Author of the Old Testament.

The perfect adaptation of these restrictions to abolish slavery is proved by their result. In no period of their history did they make slavery a great figure in their affairs. In their early history, they probably had no more than from 30,000 to 50,000 slaves. After the Babylonish captivity, we read of only 7,337 slaves—or about one to every six of the Jews. (Ezra ii. 65.) So few were the slaves of any kind among the Jews; and such is the anti-slavery nature of the Old Testament, that slavery with the Jews can hardly be pronounced a Jewish institution.*

Turning to slavery among the heathen: "A small aristocracy governed at Attica, while the soil was cultivated by a working class of 400,000 slaves; and a similar disproportion existed throughout Greece. The island of Aegina is stated to have held at one time 470,000 slaves, a large proportion of whom were agricultural serfs. The slave population of Corinth, in her greatest prosperity, was rated at 460,000 slaves. According to a learned article on 'the democracy of Athens,' in the *New York Review* for July, 1840, the whole number of slaves in Attica was about 365,000 to 95,000 citizens and 45,000 resident foreigners. Even Aristotle considered the relation of master and slave just as indispensable, in a well-ordered state,

*The Hebrew word עֶבֶד—*ebed*—"servant," is never rendered slave in our version. (Jer. ii. 14 is an addition of the word "*slave*," as not in the Hebrew,) It is rendered "servant" in about 700 times, and is applied to kings, captains, God's people, etc., as well as to Hebrew servants. It is even applied to Christ. (Isa. xlix. 7; l. 10; liii. 11.) See, also, *Ges. Lex. Heb.* This use of the word may indicate that "servant" as among the Hebrews was a very mild form of subordination, and be, in this connection, appreciated.

as husband and wife. (*Arist. Pol., b.* 1, *ch.* 1.) . . . Hume, in his essay on the *Populousness of Ancient Nations*, says that some great men among the Romans possessed to the number of 10,000 slaves. In the Augustan age, one-half the population of the Roman world (and the whole population was estimated at 120 millions of souls) were slaves."—*Kent's. Com. on Am. Law, Vol. II., pp.* 266, 267; also, *Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 60.

Slavery with the Jews, mild as it was, became an odious institution. As to methods which the Jews adopted to free slaves, through the influence of the Old Testament, "the Rabbinists specify the following four methods: (1) Redemption by money payment; (2) a bill or ticket of freedom; (3) testamentary disposition; or (4) any act that implied manumission, such as making a slave one's heir" (*Mielziner, pp.* 65, 66).—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. IV., p.* 3060. In our Savior's time, though slavery flourished with the Gentiles, it was a rare thing to find a Jew holding slaves. The Old Testament elevated a barbarous nation, protected the captive from cruelty, and finally set him free.

5. JEWISH AND HEATHEN TREATMENT OF SLAVES COMPARED. —Kent says: "Personal slavery prevailed with uncommon rigor in the free states of antiquity; and it can not but diminish very considerably our sympathy with their spirit and our reverence for their institutions. A vast majority of the people of ancient Greece were in a state of absolute slavery. The disproportion between freemen and slaves was nearly in the ratio of 30,000 to 400,000. At Athens they were treated with more humanity than in Thessaly, Crete, Argos or Sparta; for at Athens the philosophers taught and recommended humanity to slaves as a sure test of virtue. They were entitled to sue their master for excessive ill-usage, and compel him to sell them (the Bible, in such case, freed them, as we have

seen); and they had also the privilege of purchasing their freedom. In the Roman republic, the practice of predial and domestic slavery was equally countenanced and still more abused. There were instances of private persons owning singly no less than four thousand slaves; and by the Roman law, slaves were considered in the light of goods and chattels, and could be sold or pawned. They could be tortured, and even put to death, at the discretion of their masters. By a succession of edicts, which humanity, reason and policy dictated, the jurisdiction of life and death over slaves was taken from their masters and referred to the magistrate; and the dungeons of cruelty were abolished."—*Kent's Com. on Am. Law, Vol. II., pp.* 266, 267. This law, ameliorating the condition of slaves, was made *after* Christianity threw its light over the world—in the first and second centuries. For this change no glory is, therefore, due to heathenism. This was the horrible condition of slaves in the brightest ages of "civilized" Greece and Rome—excepting Athens. In that condition of things, killing of a slave was no more than killing a quadruped. "When a master was murdered by one of his domestic slaves, all the slaves of his household at the time were to be put to death; and Tacitus gives a horrible instance, in the time of Nero, ... of four hundred slaves being put to death with the approbation of the senate, for the murder of a master by one slave."—*Kent's Com. on Am. Law, p.* 267. Blackstone gives the theory of heathen slave law: "The conqueror, says the civilian, has a right to the life of his captive; and having spared that, he has a right to deal with him as he pleases."—*Chit. Blackstone, Vol. I., p.* 332. See also *Introd. Roman Law, by Hadley, p.* 113; *Lecky's Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 65; *Intel. Develop. Europe, p.* 184; *Lecky's Hist. Europ. Rationalism, Vol. II; p.* 226; *Wilson's Outlines of Hist., p.* 753. See Exodus, chapters i. and ii.,

especially the account of the wholesale slaughter of infants, as proof of how the most "civilized" nation of that age regarded the person and lives of slaves. 1 Sam. xxx. 13 may throw farther light upon how lightly heathen people regard the lives of slaves. Space does not permit me to fully describe the horrors of slavery among heathen nations. They sought neither its abolition nor the removal of its cruelty. As Lecky says: "The legitimacy of slavery was *fully* recognized with them."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 65. It is therefore evident that the Old Testament in its treatment of slavery, alone, proves itself a humane—a *divine* book.

CHAPTER XII.

Women, Marriage, the Family, Chastity, according to the Old Testament.

1. *Both the man and the woman, convicted of adultery, were put to death.* (Deut. xxii. 22–24; Lev. xx. 10.)

2. *The parties convicted of fornication were compelled to marry each other.* The man had to pay—what was then—an enormous sum, fifty shekels of silver, to the father of the maiden, and could never be divorced from her. (Deut. xxii. 28, 29; Exod. xxii. 16.)

3. *The one who committed rape was put to death, upon conviction.* (Deut. xxii. 25.)

The adoption and enforcement of the above three laws is a sore need of our time and country. To the insulted and ruined our laws are mere mockery.

4. *Unnatural crimes were death.* Exod. xxii. 19; Lev. xviii. 23, 24; xx. 13, 15, 16; xviii. 22. (See Romans i. 21–32; ii. 24, 27.) "All these crimes were common among the Egyptians, Canaanites, Greeks and Romans, etc."—*Adam Clarke's Commentary on Lev. xx.* 19.

5. *All kinds of incest forbidden.* Read Lev. xviii. 6–17; xx. 11, 12, 17, 19–22.

7. Monogamy was the law of the Old Testament. This is evident from many considerations.

a. But one woman is recorded in the Old Testament for but one man. (Gen. ii. 22–24.) By this, Jesus condemns all other sexual relations: "Have ye not *read*, that he which

made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, For *this cause* shall a man leave father and mother, and shall *cleave* to his wife [not wives; προςεκολλήθήσεταὶ—*proskollao*—rendered "cleave," the word for "glued to," signifying the unchangeable and indissoluble bond]: and they twain shall be *one* flesh?"—Matt. xix. 4, 5.

b. The origin of polygamy is its condemnation. *First.* It originated with the wicked posterity of a murderer—Cain. *Second.* It originated in the period when darkness, crime and "great violence" had begun to cover the earth. Gen. iv. 23. This was about five hundred years after the creation.

c. Kings being the example for their people, were forbidden to multiply wives. Deut. xvii. 17.

d. Widow of one man is often mentioned in the Old Testament, but never does it so mention more than one widow. Deut. x. 18; xiv. 29; xxvii. 19; Ps. cxlvi. 9; Jer. vii. 6; Ezek. xxii. 7. If the Old Testament had spoken of *widows* of one man, it would not have condemned polygamy by ignoring the concubines he left.

e. The righteous persons or the saved in the ark were monogamists. Gen. vii. 13. All polygamists were drowned.

f. Job, the eminently righteous man, had but one wife.

g. At the close of the flood and at the beginning anew of the world, it was begun on a system of monogamy. Gen. vii. 13.

h. Polygamy is so recorded as to warn all against it, as evil and only evil. Lamach, a man of blood, is the first recorded polygamist. Gen. iv. 23. The happy life of Abraham's wedded love is blasted by his taking a second wife; while it brings bitterness to the second wife. (Gen. xvi. 1–9.) In verse 8, God refuses to recognize Hagar as a wife. Jacob was a polygamist; and some of his sons were dissolute, cruel, jealous—the fruits of polygamy. David was a polygamist,

and had as bitter, sinful, disgraceful and calamitous a family history as is on record. But all went well before he violated law. Solomon was a polygamist; hence, the calamity and downfall of his kingdom after his death. His sun went down behind a cloud.

i. Monogamy is commended as being a life of deepest joy. "Rejoice with the wife (not wives) of thy youth."—Prov. v. 18. "Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing"* (not wives).—Prov. xviii. 22. "A prudent wife (not wives) is from the Lord."—Prov. xix. 14.

j. The slur upon the eunuch state was a condemnation of polygamy. (Deut. xxiii. 1.) Eunuchs have always been a necessity to harems in the East.

k. Prohibition of marrying one sister while the other was living. (Lev. xviii. 18.) The margin renders it "one wife to another." Adam Clarke says: "Some think the text may be so understood as to forbid polygamy."—*Commentary, in loco.* Anyhow, the forbidding of taking one sister together with another as wife, and the reason given—equally applicable to *any case*—is about equivalent to an absolute prohibition of polygamy. That the Hebrew may be rendered "wife to another" is certainly true. In Exod. xxvi. 3, and in other places, the same Hebrew – אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ—is rendered "one to another." Not insisting on the marginal rendering, which is likely true, these eleven considerations, taken together, condemn polygamy, and tend to its abolishment. Of the desire of marriage for the sole purpose of "the propagation of children," and the anti-polygamic nature of the Old Testament, Harless remarks: "This last error it was which caused, for example,

* "Thing" is a serious fault in the translation. טוֹב—*tob*—means good as to purpose, good in a moral sense, joyous, glad, happy, prosperous. It should be rendered, "finds (or gets, as the Hebrew means both) a wife finds good"—*i. e.*, blessing from God.

the polygamies of the patriarchs of the people of Israel—a relation which nowhere in the Old Testament is mentioned with approval; nay, rather is actually set down as something abnormal; since the theocratic blessing, according to God's will, passes on to the sons of the first and lawful wife, as to Isaac, Judah, and not to the sons of the concubines or of the additional wife, as Ishmael, Joseph, etc. And it has justly been found to be significant, that this violation of the original order of things began with the race of Cain (Gen. iv. 19)." —*Sys. Chr. Eth., p.* 434. Polygamy was not the general practice among the Jews.* It was only a rare exception in our Savior's time, so effectual was the Old Testament in removing it.

8. THE POSITION OF THE WIVES UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT WAS EMINENTLY JUST AND HAPPY.

a. The law equally punished the husband for adultery—death to either as its penalty. (Deut. xxii. 22–24; Lev. xx. 10.) With us nearly all the guilt is on the woman. In such case it was not divorce, but death to both the guilty parties.

b. The petulant, jealous husband, convicted of slandering his wife, was publicly whipped and exceedingly heavily fined. (Deut. xxii. 13, 19.)

c. In addition to whipping and fining him, he had to keep her as his *wife*, and could never divorce her. The wisdom and benevolence of never being permitted to divorce her was that such a woman was too good to be divorced; and, if divorced, as he had injured her character, she would not likely be able to marry again.

d. The law compelled the husband to supply food and

* "Michaelis, who was not an 'orthodox' (*Laws of Moses, III.* 5, *sec.* 95), asserts that polygamy ceased entirely after the return from captivity."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. III., p.* 1795.

clothing to his wife, even in case he took a second one. (Exod. xxi. 10.)

e. The law compelled him to give her his companionship and all included in the conjugal duty. This taught him that, as well as something to eat and wear, he owed his *wife* his love and companionship.

It is objected that the law gave power of divorcement to only the husband.

To this I reply, *first*, Moses never gave the husband the right to divorce his wife. It is an evil which Moses found existing among the Jews; and an evil that could not be abolished without entailing greater evils than it is. Tholuck says: "The existence of the custom of doing so is presupposed, in Deut. xxiv. 1."—*Tholuck's Sermon on the Mount, p.* 226; so Stier—*Words of Jesus, Vol. I., pp.* 169, 170; G. W. Clark—*Commentary on Matt. v.* 31, 32; *Comp. Commentary;* Scott, Whitby, Adam Clarke, Beza, etc. On Exod. xxi. 2, Deut. xxiv. 1–4, Beza, in a laconic manner, comments: "Because politic laws are constrained to bear with some things, it followeth not that God alloweth them all."—Quoted in *Comp. Commentary.*

Our Savior tells us that Moses never originated, but only suffered divorce because the people would bear nothing better. The Pharisees claimed that Moses *commanded* divorce. But Jesus contradicts them: "Moses, *because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered* ["The Greek, rendered suffer, επετρεψεν —*epitrepo*—is used in the Greek classics for yielding to lust." —*Pat. Legg.*, 802, *B.*—*ep. tais epithmiais.* In every one of its occurrences in the New Testament, it implies yielding to desires of others.—yielded your lusts as the less of two evils. "Permitted—*epetrepsen*, not *eneteilato*, enjoined."—*Bengel on Matt. xix.* 8.] you put away your wives; but from the *beginning* it was not so."—Matt. xix. 8. "So great is the pervers-

ity of the human mind, that there are not a few things by which it ought to be put to the blush, as the Jews ought to have been in the cause of the writing of divorcement, but which it abuses to a preposterous clearing (justification) of itself." "The origin of wedlock was recorded by the same Moses, from whom our Lord demonstrates the matter."—*Bengel's Commentary, in loco.* Of the language in Deut. xxiv., after explaining it as here explained, President Hovey, of Newton Theological Seminary, says: "And it is to be remembered that the language . . . . was a part of the civil code, to be enforced by the power of the State. As such, it was adapted to the moral condition of the people. If it forbear to assert the original law of marriage, it was because the nation could not bear it. And the same may be true of many nations at the present time; the public conscience may be so dull and perverted, and the public depravity so great, as to require permission of divorce for more causes than one."—*Script. Law of Divorce, p.* 28. Let it be understood that Moses never enjoined divorce.

Second. Moses condemns divorce by recording the original law of marriage. (Gen. ii. 22–24.)

Third. In neither commanding nor suffering the wife to divorce her husband, he condemned divorce. It was the custom for husbands to divorce their wives. Their wives, as the weaker, not being able to divorce their husbands, were free from the sin of doing so. Moses could not say, "Let her write him a bill of divorcement;" for women did not then divorce their husbands—there was not then such custom upon the part of wives to regulate. Had he commanded them to divorce their husbands, he would have *originated* an additional loosening of the marriage bond, and an additional violation of the seventh commandment. In the fact, then, that he did

not command the wife to divorce her husband, we have divorce condemned.

The infidel objection is based on the assumption that Moses *commanded* the husband to divorce his wife—which I have just proved groundless—and that he, therefore, ought to have commanded the wife to divorce her husband. On this the infidel assumes that, in Moses not saying, "Let her give him a writing of divorcement," he was partial to the husband. But we have just seen that this is not true. Besides, we have seen that Moses enjoined equal chastity of the man—equal faithfulness to the marriage bond.

If we were to admit that it was then the custom for the wife to put away her husband, and that Moses prohibited her from doing so, it would not follow that he did so from partiality to the husband. For with so barbarous a people as the people were then, we can see how prohibiting the man from divorcing his wife would have subjected the wife to abuse, death – to get rid of her; while the wife, being the "weaker vessel," more tender and more faithful, would have, generally, needed no such an escape for her lust to save her husband from its outburst.

Fourth. The Old Testament severely condemns the husband for divorcing his wife. "But as Moses at the beginning took care, in immediate connection with his precept, to prevent that wanton and abominable divorce and remarrying between the same persons, which would have been the worst consequences of such perversion (Deut. xxiv. 2–4); so, also, the last prophet, Malachi, who at the close of the Old Testament (Mal. iv. 4) enforces the whole law of Moses, with its statutes and judgments, till the coming of Him who was to bear similar witness against polygamy and divorce, alleging the high example of Abraham. Deal not treacherously, he says, with the wife of thy youth, who is thy companion (help-

meet) and the wife of thy covenant, for the Lord hath been witness between thee and her; that is, in effect, what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder! (Prov. ii. 17.) Take heed to your spirit, he says, that ye apologize not by the letter of the law for your sin against its spirit. 'If he hate her, let him put her away, saith the Lord'—that is the wicked language of your own spirit; *but* it is *also* said, 'Evil will defile his garment, saith the Lord.'—Mal. ii. 14–16. Mark, here, again, the Sermon on the Mount utters or lays down nothing new, even where it seems most to do so."—*Stier, in Words of Jesus, Vol. I., pp.* 170, 171.

While noticing divorce, let us notice its wise and benevolent restrictions.

First. The husband could not divorce his wife without a bill of divorcement from the court. Deut. xxiv. 1–3. This bill was recorded in the court. In this way, a husband could not be taking a new wife every few days; neither could he exchange wives with another; neither could he put away his wife when the law did not suffer it. Otherwise he could have done so, as the law would have been in his own hands.

Second. If he had slandered his wife, or had ravished or seduced her before marriage, the law did not suffer the court to grant him the "bill of divorcement." Deut. xxii. 13–19, 28, 29; Exod. xxii. 16. By giving divorce to the seducer, ravisher and slanderer, our laws mock us. To save himself from punishment, the seducer with us often marries her, deserts her immediately, and soon is divorced! Yet we are wiser (?) than the Old Testament!

Third. To prevent the scandal and demoralization of the same persons being divorced, marrying each other again, etc., etc.—again and again; and to make them more careful about hasty separations; and to prevent one or both parties from living with several different men or women, then returning to

each other; the law so divorced them that they could never again marry each other. Deut. xxiv. 3, 4. Tholuck says of this: "In the first place, the letter of divorce was to be executed before witnesses (proof of cause mentioned being real, that it was not merely arbitrary) and with certain formalities; secondly, after its despatch, a renewal of the bond once severed was not possible (Deut. xxiv. 4)—a condition which constituted no slight hindrance to separation from momentary excitement."—*Sermon on the Mount, p.* 227. Thus, God protected morals, protected the wife from a cruel husband, preserved order. At the same time, he taught that marriage meant marriage, and not the fancies and abuses of a lustful, cruel husband.

Having pointed out the superior and eminent wisdom, impartiality and benevolence of the Old Testament, I here resume where I left off—the blessed relation of husband and wife under the Old Testament.

f. The wife exercised an important influence in her home. "She appears to have taken her part in family affairs, and even to have enjoyed a considerable amount of independence. For instance, she entertains the guests, at her own desire (2 Kings iv. 8), in the absence of her husband (Judges iv. 18), and sometimes even in defiance of his wishes (1 Sam. xxv. 14); she disposes of her child by a vow without any reference to her husband (1 Sam. i. 24); she consults with him as to the marriage of her children (Gen. xxvii. 46); her suggestions as to any domestic arrangements met with attention (2 Kings iv. 9); and occasionally she criticises the conduct of her husband in terms of great severity (1 Sam. xxv. 25; 2 Sam. vi. 20)."

g. The relations of husband and wife were generally very tender. "A newly-married man was exempt from military service, or from any public business which might draw him

away from his home, for the space of a year (Deut. xxiv. 5); a similar privilege was granted to him who was betrothed (Deut. xx. 7). . . . . He is occasionally described as the 'friend' of his wife (Jer. iii. 20; Hosea iii. 1), and his love for her is frequently noticed (Gen. xxiv. 67; xxix. 18). On the other hand, the wife was the consolation of the husband in time of trouble (Gen. xxiv. 67); and her grief at his loss presents a picture of the most abject woe (Joel i. 8). No stronger testimony, however, can be afforded as to the ardent affection of husband and wife, than that which we derive from the general tenor of the book of Canticles."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. III., p.* 1806. Of course, there was the contrary to this, to the extent that the Old Testament was unable to root out polygamy and other evils.

9. The position of women in general under the Old Testament.

a. "Concubines" of the Hebrews. These were all but the first wife. "In judging of it, we must take into regard the following considerations: (1) That the principle of monogamy was retained even in the practice of polygamy, by the distinction made between the chief or original wife and the secondary wives, or as the ancient version terms them, 'concubines'—a term which is objectionable, inasmuch as it conveys to us the notion of an illicit and unrecognized position, whereas the secondary wife was regarded by the Hebrews as a wife, and her rights were secured by law; (2) that the motive which led to polygamy was the absorbing desire of progeny, which is prevalent throughout eastern countries, and was especially powerful among the Hebrews; and (3) that the power of a parent (according to customs, not the result of law. All peoples have their peculiar marriage and family customs) over his child, and of a master over his slave, was paramount even in matters of marriage, and led, in many cases, to phases of

polygamy that are otherwise quite unintelligible; as, for instance, to the cases where it was adopted by the husband *at the request of the wife*, under the idea that children born to a slave were in the eye of the law the children of the mistress (Gen. xvi. 3; xxx. 4, 9); or, again, to cases where it was adopted at the instance of the father (Gen. xxix. 23, 28; Exod. xxi. 9, 10)."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. III., p.* 1794. Such polygamy is far from being an institution of "kept mistresses," as in modern times.

The rights of these second-class wives were protected; and so were those of their children. Deut. xxi. 15–17. They were not as well provided for by law; for they were an abnormal institution.

b. Wives of servants, themselves slaves for life, who were married during Hebrew servitude. Exod. xxi. 4–6 refers to only cases where a Hebrew servant had married a Gentile slave—a slave for life. This was probably of rare occurrence. As the Jews believed the Gentile slaves were slaves for life, and, especially, as they had bought them, they could not be induced to loose them; the best that Moses could do was to provide for the permanence of the marriage. This was by the Hebrew becoming a servant for life. The ceremony of boring the ear was not an act of cruelty, any more than boring ladies' ears for rings, but was a ceremony by which the slave acknowledged subjection to his master. Boring the ear for that purpose was an ancient custom. If Moses had not provided by law for this Hebrew to become a servant with his wife, rather than have let the Gentile wife go free with her husband, the cruel master would have broken off the marriage relation. Of course, it would have been better to have set the wife free with her husband, if it could have been done; but the "hardness of their hearts," which compelled the toleration of polygamy, and slavery, and divorce, compelled Moses

to do the "next best" thing. This special provision for the Hebrew husband to become a slave for life with his Gentile wife taught the sacredness of marriage, and thus reflected on polygamy and slavery; for why make this exception to the law that a Hebrew could not be a slave for life, unless there was something very sacred in marriage requiring it? Not only did this exception to the law teach the sacredness of marriage, but it taught that a Gentile and Gentile slave was so *equal* with *any one else* that she ought not to be separated from her husband. This master let the Hebrew servant take her to wife, not really as a wife, but only as a wife for while serving out his time. But Jehovah put a scathing rebuke on such doings, by making a great exception to the law, by which even the master's Hebrew *brother* might become a Gentile *slave*, rather than thus trifle with a woman's affections and rights. In this Jehovah reiterated the great law, even through Hebrew slavery, that "for this cause shall a man *cleave* (be cemented) to his wife." This one law, rightly understood, has the tendency to restore marriage to its original condition.

c. From what we can gather, it seems that the husbands and the wives of slaves were not sold from each other as in other nations. The law taught that they were moral beings; the moral law was for them as well as for others; the above provision for the Hebrew servant to become a slave for life in order to remain with his wife (of course, if they were liable to be sold from each other, there would be no encouragement for him to enter slavery for life in order to remain with his wife)—all teach that husbands and wives could not be sold from each other. The reader will please consider these two points on the marriage of slaves as showing the easy condition of slaves under the Old Testament law; in this sense they may be added, in the reader's mind, to Chapter II. and point "2."

d. The power of the parent to give or sell his daughter in marriage was not a law or custom originated by the Old Testament. See Gen. xxix. 18, 27; xxxiv. 11, 12; Judges xiv. 3; 1 Sam. xviii. 23, 26; Prov. ii. 17; Mal. ii. 14; Gen. xi. 15; Joshua xv. 18, 19; Judges i. 12, 15; 1 Kings ix. 16. This custom, though objectionable, insures as much happiness as many of the ways by which such unions are now formed. But it was a custom of many nations. Moreover, the children were often—if not always—consulted by their parents about their future "intendeds;' and the mother, sometimes, alone gave away her child in marriage. Gen. xxvii. 46; xxi. 21; xxxiv. 34; Judges xiv. 1–10; Gen. xxiv. 58. With the customs of the times the Old Testament did not directly meddle, except where they were so grossly wrong as in divorce, polygamy, slavery, etc. Of course, its nature tended to correct them in those things in which they were not in the strictest harmony with morality.

e. The Old Testament places the highest kind of estimate upon woman. In Genesis it is recorded that from the crudest form of animal life the Creator proceeded to the highest in the animal creation. Each succeeding creation is higher than the previous. Adam appears as higher than the beasts. But the *crown of creation is not in him, but in woman.* A great biblical scholar says: "If man is the head, she is the crown —a crown to her husband, the crown of the visible creation. The man was dust refined, but woman was dust doubly refined—one remove further from the earth." Matthew Henry well remarks: "That woman was taken out of man, not out of his head to top him, nor out of his feet to be trampled under foot; but out of his side to be equal to him, under his arm to be protected, and near his heart to be beloved."

The Old Testament presents man in the image of God;

but in placing woman as the crown of creation, it places her as his brighter image.

Some of the most beautiful, touching, and tender Old Testament Scriptures are on woman. The touching, tender history of the care of Moses' mother for him; the touching, tender care of Pharaoh's daughter for the infant Moses; the touching, tender history of Naomi and Ruth; the touching, tender history of the Shumanite woman; of Hannah, etc., all present the Old Testament as a green spot in the desert. Women are spoken of in the Old Testament as holding eminent positions. There were the prophetesses Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Noadiah and Anna. The advice of others were sought in emergencies. They took their part in public matters. (2 Sam. xiv. 2; xx. 16–21; Exod. xv. 20; 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7.) But she appears especially in her glory as the "better half" of man. "Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing,* and obtaineth favor of the Lord."—Prov. xviii. 22. "Houses and riches"—a father—earth can give; but "a prudent *wife* is *from* the Lord."—Prov. xix. 14. In this heavenly gift man is to rejoice: "Rejoice with the wife of thy youth."—Prov. v. 18. Touching is the record of the patriarch Abraham, mourning the death of Sarah, the wife of his youth and companion in the trials and toils of his pilgrimage: "And Abraham came to mourn for Sarah and to weep for her." The poor, old man, broken in heart, "a stranger and sojourner," left alone, with no place to bury his dead—"And Abraham stood up from before his dead, and spoke to the sons of Heth, saying, I am a stranger and a sojourner with you. Give me a possession of a burying-place with you, that I may bury my dead out of my sight."—Gen. xxiii. 1–20.

* "Thing" is not in the Hebrew. See "*k*" of "7" in this chapter—foot note.

Woman brings the Redeemer into the world. Isa. vii. 14. In view of the exalted position which women in the Old Testament occupy, we can but pity poor Ingersoll's madness, when he says: "There is not one word about woman in the Old Testament, except the words of shame and humiliation." (Ps. liii. 1.)

It is objected that woman is represented in the Old Testament as introducing sin into the world. But, for this, Adam is the one the Bible represents as being chiefly responsible—as bringing it into the world. (Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22.) Besides, Genesis condemns Adam by recording him as so mean that he laid his transgression on his wife. (Gen. iii. 12.) If Eve were represented as introducing sin into the world, Adam is here represented as *deliberately* sinning, then as guilty of the meanness of laying his sin on his wife. Gen. iii. 16—latter part—"expresses not indeed what should be, but what would so generally be the effect of the apostacy on woman's relations in the married state. The stronger party in this relation, instead of being the natural guardian and protector of the weaker, would use his superior power to suppress and debase her. Such has always been the case, except so far as the influence of revelation has counteracted the influences of the fall."—*T. J. Conant, D. D., on Genesis, pp.* 18, 19.

10. CHILDREN UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT.—With the sanctity of marriage and the purity of the religious teachings of the Old Testament, the condition of Hebrew children must have been good. No one can candidly read the laws on justice, benevolence, chastity, etc., as I have pointed them out, without concluding that they must have made good men and women of the Jewish children. The parents were to strictly raise their children, and take great pains to teach them the laws and history of the Old Testament. See Deut. iv. 9; vi.

6–9; xi. 18–21; Joshua xxii. 24, 25; Deut. xxxi. 12, 13; xxx. 2; Ps. cxxxii. 12; Joshua iv. 20–24. The moral and intellectual development of the Jews under the Old Testament proves that their children were well raised.

It is here objected that "a disobedient child was stoned to death."—Deut. xxi. 18–21. In reply to this, I, *first*, urge that children did not then rule their parents as they often do now. "Honor thy father and thy mother."—Exod. xx. 12; Col. iii. 20; Eph. vi. 4; Col. iii. 21.

Second. The child to be stoned was a son, never a daughter. The reader will, in this fact, observe the tenderness with which the Old Testament deals with *women*. A daughter is presumed by this law to need no such law.

Third. The son must be a "stubborn, rebellious" son, a "glutton" and a "drunkard." Such a son was no ordinary case, but a hopeless one. No other son could be punished by this law.*

Fourth. The father's authority continuing till the son left home, this† son was probably grown up to the age of manhood. (*Biblical Antiquities, by Nevin, p.* 134.) This made the case more desperate.

Fifth. Inasmuch as the theory of the Jewish law was capital punishment for only the worst of crimes, this law branded the crime of such a profligate son one of the worst. Who will deny that a "gluttonous," "stubborn," "drunken" and "rebellious" son is not one of the greatest griefs to a parent!

---

* The four Hebrew words to describe this son denote the worst, lowest possible case; especially does סוֹרֵר—*marah*—rebellious and זוֹלֵל—*zalal*. The latter term means one a voluptuary, a debauchee. Such a son was evidently grown in years, possibly old enough to die by the law for such crimes.

† The fact that the son was "chastened" is no evidence against his being "grown up," since the authority of the father over him continued while he was with the father.

Sixth. Only "the parents were permitted to be plaintiffs, and *both* must concur in the complaint to make it legal."

Seventh. The son must be brought before the elders of the city, tried and convicted by *law* before he could be stoned to death. These last two laws were a check on any haste about the execution. The Lord well knew that it would have to be a most desperate case to get the concurrence of father and *mother* in the death of their own offspring. If a son happened to have unfeeling parents, when tried before these gray-headed sages, the parents would be found careless in their raising, and as much moved by prejudice in bringing him before the elders of the city. In such case, a conviction would be very improbable.

Eighth. This law would so effectually intimidate and restrain, that there could be few such sons in all Jewish history.

Ninth. "There is no case on record in which a person was put to death under this law."—*Haley, in Alleged Discrep., p.* 287.

Such a law with us would make less "fast young men" than we have.

In comparing the Hebrew family with the family of heathen and infidel nations, etc., we find the former so far superior that they scarcely admit of a comparison. *a.* "With the ancients the father alone had the power over his children of life and death, and, generally, without restraint of law."—*Lecky's Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 28. "Pagan and Christian authorities are, however, united in speaking of infanticide as a crying vice of the empire."—*Idem, p.* 29. "The ancients generally carried the power of the parent to a most atrocious extent over the person and liberty of the child. The Persians, Egyptians, Greeks, Gauls and Romans tolerated infanticide, and allowed to fathers a very absolute dominion over their offspring; but the Romans, according to Justinian, ex-

ceeded all other people, and the liberty and lives of the children were placed within the power of the father."—*Kent's Com. on Am. Law., Vol. II., p.* 211. "Until Christianity made the change, this fearful crime continued."—*Idem, p.* 212. Confucius taught that while a son's "parents are alive, the son may not go abroad to a distance. If he does go abroad, he must have a fixed place to go to; and should they punish him, he does not allow himself to murmur."—*Confucius, translated by Legge, p.* 137. Legge says of Confucius' system: "There is little room left for the play and development of natural affection."—*Idem, p.* 71. "Among the Jews, as among most nations of antiquity, the parental power was absolutely despotic, even to life and death. The Mosaic law, however, enacted that a guilty son could not be punished with death, except by judicial sentence of the community."—*Milman's Hist. of Jews, Vol. I., p.* 22—quoted by *Mozley's Ruling Ideas of Early Ages, p.* 46. Gen. xlii. 37 shows that the Jews before this were like others.

b. Heathen nations have always treated their women as bad as they have treated their children. In Greece, women had no voice as to who should be their husbands. "And it must be admitted that the legal disabilities under which they labored were neither few nor small. . . . . They had no voice in answering the most important of questions; . . . . of saying yes or no."—*Ancient and Modern Greece, by Felton, p.* 235. Lecky says: "In general, the position of virtuous Greek women was a very low one. She was under a perpetual tutelage; first of all, to her parents, who disposed of her hand; then to her husband, and in her days of widowhood to her sons. . . . . Marriage was regarded chiefly in a civil light, as a means of producing citizens; and in Sparta it was ordered that old or infirm husbands should cede their young wives to stronger men, who could produce vigorous soldiers

for the State. . . . . For the most part, virtuous women scarcely appear in Greek history. . . . . In general, the only women who attracted the notice of the people were the *courtesans.*"—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., p.* 306. On page 308 Lecky informs us that they cared nothing for virtue, and that "the most virtuous men habitually and openly entered into relations which would be now almost universally censured." See also pages 296, 299, 310, 311, 314; *Schaff's Hist. Chr. Church, Vol. I., p.* 326; *Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 85; *Wilson's Outlines of History, p.* 661. Plato and Socrates, the leading philosophers, taught and practiced these immoral horrors. For instance, Lecky informs us that Socrates visited a courtesan, took his disciples with him, advised her about "her lovers, with no kind of reproach on his part; the best and wisest of the Greeks left his hostess with a graceful compliment to her beauty."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., pp.* 313, 314.*

The condition of women among the Romans was substantially the same.—*Lecky's Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., pp.* 317, 319, 322, 324, 333, 334, 336. According to Tertullian, Roman "divorce is the fruit of marriage." Draper—another infidel—says of Rome in her last days, under *infidelity:* "Women of the higher class were so lascivious, depraved and degenerate, that men could not be compelled to contract matrimony with them; marriage was displaced by concubin-

* Speaking of the infidel attempt to misrepresent ancient morals, by selecting the few exceptions to ancient immorality and holding them before the people, that eminent, scholarly writer and historian, Prof. George P. Fisher, says: "But when one hears laudations of ancient morals, as if there were a state of things for a moment to be compared with the pure atmosphere of Christian society, he can hardly avoid reminding the authors of such false and ignorant comparisons, that the noblest man of the ancients went with his disciples to visit a prostitute, not to advise her to sin no more, but to talk on the question how to ply her occupation with more profit."—*North American Review,* February, 1882, p. 176.

age; even virgins were guilty of inconceivable immodesties; great officers of the court, and ladies of the court, of promiscuous and naked exhibitions."—*Intel. Dvelop. of Europe, p.* 187. With these facts before him, Underwood, a leading American infidel lecturer and writer, says: "Woman's position in the pagan empire was one of great social dignity." He rebukes "the clergy" for regarding this condition of women as little better than prostitution, and says this concubinage "was strictly *legal* and *honorable.*"—*Inf. of Chr. on Civ., by Underwood, pp.* 18, 19 (my italics). Lecky says: "The practice of bringing up orphans for prostitution was equally common."—*Hist. Europ. Mor., p.* 233. He says: "There can be no question that the moral condition of the sex was exceedingly low."—*Idem, p.* 326; also, *Hadley on Roman Law, p.* 143; *Wilson's Outlines of History, p.* 753; *Schaff's Hist. Chr. Church, Vol. I., pp.* 327–329; *Milman's Hist. Chr., Vol. III., pp.* 294, 295; *Michelet's Hist. France, Vol. II., pp.* 297, 302; *The Late Civil War, p.* 51; *Merivale's Hist. Romans;* Prof. George P. Fisher, in *North American Review,* etc.

With the Chinese and Hindoos, and other heathen, the matter was and is, if possible, worse than among the Greeks and Romans. Mencius taught affection between father and son and sovereign minister, but "between husband and wife attention to their separate functions."—*Confucius, p.* 105. Confucius taught that woman "can determine nothing of herself, and is subject to the rule of three obediences. When young, she must obey her father and elder brother; when married, she must obey her husband; when her husband is dead, she must obey her son. She may not think of marrying the second time. No instructions or orders must issue from the harem. Woman's business is simply the preparation and supply of wine and food. Beyond the threshold of

her apartments, she should not be known for evil or for good. She may not cross the boundaries of a State to accompany a funeral. She may take no step on her own motion, and may come to no conclusion of her own deliberation. There are five women who may not be taken in marriage: the daughter of a rebellious house; the daughter of a disorderly house; the daughter of a house which has produced criminals; the daughter of a leprous house; and the daughter who has lost her father and elder brother. The grounds for divorce are disobedience to her husband's parents; not giving birth to a son; dissolute conduct; jealousy (of her harem); talkativeness, and thieving. The three considerations which may overrule these grounds are—First, if she was taken from a home, she has now no home to return to; second, if she has passed with her husband through three years' mourning for *his* parents; third, if the husband has become rich from being poor. All these regulations were adopted by the sages in harmony with the natures of man and woman, and to give importance to the ordinance of marriage."—*Confucius, p.* 106. So, it seems, Confucius put away his wife.—*Confucius, p.* 71.

Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, the doctrine of about 300,000,000 of the race, says: "So long as the love of man towards woman, even the smallest, is not destroyed, so long is his mind in bondage, as the calf that drinks milk is to its mother."—*Science of Religion, by Max Muller, p.* 270. Buddha's abominable doctrine on women, his followers have always closely followed. The same is true of Brahmanism, with its 110,000,000 of devotees. Their sacred books and the writings of their priests unite in degrading women. In the "Hindoo Proverbs," among other characteristics of a virtuous woman, we read that she is one "who bears a son, and who rises from sleep before her husband; who always acts according to her husband's pleasure; who goes not out of the house."—*He-*

brew Student, Apr., p. 9. With Mohammedanism the condition of women is about the same. It numbers about 160,000,000. So of all heathen. No wonder at the countless murders of infant females, and at the anxiety of widows to burn themselves to get out of a cruel world. I have space here to only hint at the horrible facts in my possession upon the condition of all heathen women.

Infidels have endeavored to lessen the force of the condition of heathen women, and disparage the Bible, by the account which Tacitus gives of the condition of heathen women in ancient Germany. But Guizot has shown that Tacitus was only exaggerating the condition of the Germans, in a spirit of ill-humor against his countrymen; and that, like all other heathen, the Germans were barbarians, and kept their women in a very low condition. See *Guizot's Hist. of Civ., Vol. I., pp.* 415, 422–429, 72. Guizot pronounces the superiority of these Germans, "as regards the relations of the two sexes, etc., mere fancies."

The reader will here please turn to Chapter III. of this book, and read infidel morals (?), infidel virtue (?), and the degradation of women by infidelity. Several years ago, the writer happened to attend the Minnesota State Spiritual Convention. That voted down "free love," not because it regarded it wrong, but because it would injure its influence. No bawdy-house convention would have been more disregardful of the most sacred laws of religion and morals. Two national conventions of Spiritualists have refused to disfellowship the most known libertines. One of them, at Chicago, adopted "the only plan approved by its committee," and especially provided that no charge should ever be entertained against any member, and that any person, without any regard to moral character, might become a member."—*Spiritualism, by M. Grant, p.* 45; see *Spiritualism, by W. M'Donald.* Lecky

thus disparages women: "Intellectually, inferior to man; women very rarely love truth; little capable of impartiality or of doubt; rarely generous in their opinions; less capable than men of perceiving qualifying circumstances." He slurs religion and women in the same breath: "Innumerable pulpits support this thought, and represent with a fervid rhetoric well fitted to *excite the nerves* and *imaginations of women.*"—*Hist. Europ. Mor., Vol. II., pp.* 377, 381 (my italics). Underwood had so little regard for women and for virtue, that he said their degraded condition in Rome was "legal and honorable."—*Chr. and Civ., p.* 19. The infidel reign in France, in 1791, "for the first time among a civilized people," abolished the law protecting female virtue, and "established the principle that seduction is neither a crime nor the violation of any contract."—*Org. of Labor, by Le Play, p.* 164. Ever since they made this law, women have been degraded in France. In England, in the seventeenth century, women were degraded by the reign of infidelity. Dryden, an infidel, wrote:

"Why should a foolish marriage vow,
Which long ago was made,
Oblige us to each other now,
When passion has decayed?
We loved, and we loved, as long as we could,
Till our love was loved out of us both.
But our marriage is dead,
When the pleasure is fled;
'Twas pleasure first made it an oath."

Walter Scott's indignation at this infidel reign is well put:

"Dryden, in immortal strain,
Had raised the table round again,
But that a ribald king and court,
Bade him toil on to make them sport;

"Demanded for their niggard pay,
Fit for their souls, a looser lay,
Licentious satires, song and play;
The world defrauded of the high design,
Profaned the God-given strength and marred the lofty lines."
—*Scott's Poetical Works, Vol. VII., p. 36*—quoted.

So Pope, an infidel, writes to a female friend to

"Not quit the free innocence of life,
For the dull glory of a virtuous wife."
—*Reed's Hist. English Lit., p. 227, 237.*

Taine, a skeptic, says of the condition of women under this infidel reign: "It had neither taste nor refinement, and wished to appear as if it possessed them. Panderers and licentious women bullying and butchering courtiers; . . . . a king who would bandy obscenities in public with his half-naked mistresses—such was this illustrious society."—*Taine's Hist. English Lit., Vol. II., p.* 13. Macaulay says of this infidel time: "The culture of the female mind seems to have been almost entirely neglected. If a damsel had the least smattering of literature, she was recognized as a prodigy. Ladies highly born, highly bred, and naturally quick-witted, were unable to write a line in their mother tongue without solecisms and faults of spelling, such as a charity girl would now be ashamed to commit. The explanation may easily be found. Extravagant licentiousness . . . . was now the mode, and licentiousness had produced its ordinary effect, the moral and intellectual degradation of women." – *History of England, Vol. I., p.* 117. Reed says: "No company of writers has sunk into such general and merited oblivion as the British infidels who were the precursors af the French skeptics, in the last century."—*Hist. English Lit., p.* 239. See *Buckle's Hist. Civ., Vol. I., pp.* 261, 262; *Guizot's Hist. Civ.,*

Vol. I., p. 244. Well did Bancroft, the great American historian, say of infidelity: "Her garments are red with blood, and ruin is her delight; her despair may stimulate to *voluptuousness* and revenge; she never kindled with the disinterested love of men."—*History of United States, Vol. V., pp.* 22, 24. See Josephus against Apion.

We have now seen that the Old Testament, in its teachings in regard to the family, rises immeasurably and dazzlingly above all heathen and infidel writers and practice; that, upon the family, it contains not a moral stain. If possible, infidelity is more degrading to women than heathenism. Is the infidel's immorality the cause for his venom towards the Old Testament? Would it not be better for infidelity to look at its own morals, before assailing those of the Bible? The writer suggests that every Christian press their abominable system home upon them. Mere defensive war will not even answer for defense. An aggressive war is the only thoroughly defensive war. Let it be done in sorrow and love for the deluded followers of despair and evil. As was doubting Thomas, let us hope that they may be enlightened.

CHAPTER XIII.

Things Infidels object to, Proof of the Divine Origin of the Bible.

1. Hebrews taking in war female captives to themselves.—This is spoken of in Deut. xx. 14; xxi. 10–15; Numb. xxxi. 17, 18. The infidel objects that these women were, by command of God, taken for "prostitution."

In replying to these objections, I ask the reader to turn to the rules of interpretation from Blackstone, Greenleaf and Kent, in the second chapter of this book. I here emphatically enter my protest against the reckless and unfair way in which infidels treat the Old Testament—the whole Bible. Any lawyer who should attempt to treat our laws in such a manner would be hooted out of court. If the reader is so decided to reject the Old Testament that he is not willing to interpret it strictly by the well-established laws of interpretation, he may as well lay down this book and wallow in Tom Paine, or anything that suits his taste. Abiding by these laws of interpretation, the so-called "moral difficulties" of the Old Testament readily vanish. Let the reader remember the doctrines of infidelity in this connection. See Chapters II., III., and XII. of this book. Those who hold these infidel doctrines are the ones who have so much to do in making and urging these objections.

a. These women could not, in any case, have been saved for prostitution, because the Jewish law condemned adulterers to death. "Thou shalt not commit adultery;" "whoremongers

and adulterers God will judge"—is the law and penalty of the whole Bible. Exod. xx. 14; Heb. xiii. 4; Deut. xxii. 22–24; Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 25. There is no possibility of escaping from these Scriptures on the plea that these laws were not intended to govern the Jews in their relations to Gentiles. I have shown they are of universal application. See Chapter X. of this book.

b. Because of the high estimate which the Jewish Scriptures place upon woman, the family, in no case could these women have been saved for prostitution. See last chapter.

c. They could not, in any case, have been kept for prostitution, because of the holiness of the whole Jewish law. The law which we have examined in all the previous chapters can not possibly do otherwise than condemn every wrong. As Blackstone, Greenleaf, Kent and Hedge say: "Interpret any part of the law after the 'will of its maker,' after what it says in any other place, especially upon the same subject, and compare it altogether."

d. In no case could these women have ever been saved for prostitution, because the law says they were to be saved for "wives." "And hast a desire unto her, that thou shouldest have her to thy *wife.*"—Deut. xxi. 11.* If wife means "lust," etc., then these women were to be saved for lust; otherwise, not possibly so.

e. This law regulated only a custom among heathen nations, to seize and abuse females, in time of war. Read 2 Kings viii. 12; Isa. xiii. 16–18; Lam. v. 11; Dan. xi. 37; Hosea xiii. 16; Amos i. 13; Zech. xiv. 2; 1 Sam. xxx. 2; Amos vii. 17. Because of the horrible abuse of women in ancient

* As we have seen, according to infidel "morals," "wife" is a word to indicate whatever notion we please. We need not wonder that "wife" in Deut. xxi. 11 is, by infidels, interpreted to mean "prostitute." See Chapter III. of this book, and latter part of Chapter XII.

wars, one of the most powerful incentives to a vigorous and courageous defense was in, "Fight for your *daughters*, your *wives*, and your houses."—Neh. iv. 14. By this law, the Lord made them take these women for wives instead of for abuse. The "hardness of their hearts" was such that to have not thus regulated the custom of treating female captives, would have insured what infidels recklessly claim this "law was given for"—the abuse of these women.

f. This regulation had great respect for the feelings of these captive females. Before they could be taken for wives, to give them time to mourn the loss of their friends, become acquainted with their future husbands—become reconciled to their new condition, they had to "shave their heads," and "pare their nails;" "put off the raiment of their captivity," and remain in that condition at least one month. The shaved head and pared nails enforced the time required before the marriage could take place—hair and nails must grow out before the marriage.

g. This ceremony was a token of her renouncing her religion and becoming a proselyte to the religion of the Jews. Doubtless she gave some attention, in this "month," to the new religion. The law says one month is the *required* time before the marriage. But this law is not to be interpreted so as to not leave a longer time, if the husband desired more time, to reconcile his wife to her new condition.

h. In case the soldier was, by foolish passion, moved, at the time of the capture, to think he would take a captive for a wife, which could result in only an unhappy marriage, the time required by this law before he could marry her, gave him time to reflect and reconsider the foolish intention. With so barbarous a people, one month was probably all that was usually required for these ends; and, perhaps, all that the law could limit them to, even if more time was desirable.

i. This law was for only time of *war*. Even among civilized people, war hardly knows law. But the Old Testament thus enforced the law of purity upon a barbarous people in *time of war*. The fourteenth verse of the twenty-first chapter of Deuteronomy has no bearing against these humane provisions; for they could leave the wives taken from their own people if they had "no delight" in them. חֵפֶץ is the word applied to God's delight in man; man's delight in understanding. (*a.*) But they had to leave, etc., their wives in the same manner in which they left the wives of their own people—by trial and "a bill of divorcement." See divorce in last chapter. (*b.*) They were forbidden to sell them for slaves.

2. THE SLAUGHTER OF THE MIDIANITES AND SAVING THEIR YOUNG FEMALES TO THEMSELVES.

The Midianites deserved this slaughter. *First.* The Midianites were as degraded idolaters as ever cursed the earth. Their worship was the worship of Baal-Peor. The word is compounded of two Hebrew words and signifies a mixture of cruel and voluptuous worship. Gesenius defines the word rendered Peor: "An idol of the Moabites, in whose worship females prostituted themselves."—*Ges. Heb. Lex., p.* 859. This prostitution was a part of the worship of the Midianites! The worship of Baal was bloody and cruel, in which human sacrifices were offered. (1 Kings xviii. 28; Jer. xix. 4, 5.) Where is the man who will deny that a people, beyond reach of reformation, who will offer human sacrifices and worship by prostitution, does not deserve death, for that alone? For less offenses than that our law takes life.

Second. But their worship was treason. Jehovah being the King of Israel, having an organized civil or politico-ecclesiastical government for the Jews, the worship of Baal-Peor, accepting his government, etc., was rebellion and treason against God. The Midianites did all they could to seduce

the Jews into their abominable, horrible and cursed religion; and, thus, into rebellion and treason against their King. They were the more dangerous seducers from having a common descent from Abraham. By their seduction they had brought a plague upon Israel, in which 24,000 of the Israelites had perished. See Numb. xxv. For these things the Lord commanded, "Vex the Midianites, and smite them: for they vex you with their *wiles*."—Numb. xxv. 18; xxxi. 15–18. Some of them escaped; and, after many years, so fully recovered their power as to nearly defeat the whole plan of redemption by destroying Israel, to whom was committed the "oracles of God," and the work of giving the world its Redeemer. (Rom. iii. 2.) See Judges i. and ii., etc.; Judges viii. 28. When we see how licentious, cruel and seductive these Midianites were, and how they recovered power to vex Israel after the terrible slaughter mentioned in Numb. xxxi., in the whole matter we see nothing wrong. The males of all ages were slain to guard against their ever being able to rise up against Israel. For this reason, all male infants born and infants unborn (alluded to and intended in slaying "every woman that hath known man by lying with him") were slain. Of course, the females could never retaliate or oppress. Mercy spared these female children. The same mercy would have spared the male infants, but for the fact that they would have endeavored to retaliate when grown up. As their licentious habits and worship left no *virgins* among those of adult or near adult age, *all* adult, or nearly so, women were slain. Very little is known of the relation of the Midianites to the Moabites. They both are known to have had the licentious worship of Baal-Peor. "The women of Moab are indeed said to have commenced (Numb. xxv. 1) the idolatrous fornication, which proved so destructive to Israel, but it is plain that their share in it was insignificant compared to Midian.

It was a Midianitish woman whose shameless act brought down the plague on the camp; the Midianitish women were especially devoted to destruction by Moses (Numb. xxv. 16–18; xxxi. 16); and it was upon Midian that the vengeance was taken."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. III., p.* 1981. The Midianites seemed to have carried this licentious worship far beyond where the Moabites carried it. The male infants slain were taken to the bosom of God. Thus, their being slain was a blessing; for had they been left to grow up, they would have followed the degradation and ruin of their fathers. Of these saved females, Keil well says: "The young maidens were reserved to be employed as servants, or, in case they became proselytes, to be married." Of the slain: "All the females were put to death who might possibly have engaged in the licentious worship of Peor, so that the Israelites might be reserved from contamination by that abominable idolatry."—*Keil on Numb. xxv.* 1–3, quoted in *Haley's Alleged Discrep., p.* 255. (The reader will remember the rules of interpretation in the second chapter of this book. Don't forget the infidels' doctrine upon virtue and women, as I have shown it.) See "8" on extirpation of the Canaanites.

3. HOSEA COMMANDED TO TAKE "A WIFE OF WHOREDOMS."—Hosea i. 2.

a. Remember the purity of the law, etc., and the rules of interpretation at close of first chapter.

b. Delitzsch takes the prophet as meaning simply "internal events; *i. e.*, as merely carried out in that inward and spiritual intuition in which the word of God was addressed to him." "In this view concur Bleek, Davidson, Hengstenberg, Kimchi, Knobel." [*Bleek's Introd. to Old Test., Vol. II., p.* 124; *Davidson's Introd. to Old Test., Vol. III., p.* 237—referred to in *Haley's Alleged Discrep., p.* 255.] The Chaldee Paraphrase, several rabbins, the school of Origen, Junius, and

"the bulk of modern commentators," substantially agree with Delitzsch.—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. II., p.* 1095.

c. Idolatry or spiritual whoredom may be meant. The spiritual pollution of idolatry is often set forth in both the Old and the New Testaments by such expressions. The same Hebrew noun* occurs in Nahum iii. 4; Hosea ii. 2, 4; iv. 12; v. 4, and in many other places, for idolatry. Thus we see the frequent use of the word, in its various forms, is for spiritual fornication. So it may mean that of that idolatrous people Hosea was commanded to take a wife. Another explanation by a skeptic, Prof. Robertson Smith, is worthy of consideration: "The English version of Hosea iii. does not clearly express the prophet's thought. Hosea's wife had deserted him for a stranger. But though she is thus 'in love with a paramour, and unfaithful,' his love follows her and he buys her back out of the servile condition into which she had fallen. She is brought back from shame and servitude, but not to the privilege of a wife. She must sit alone by her husband, reserved for him, but not to the relations of a wife. So Jehovah will deal with Israel."

4. COMPELLING MARRIAGE OF A BROTHER TO HIS DECEASED BROTHER'S WIFE. (Deut. xxv. 5–10.) *a.* This was an ancient and general custom, long before Moses' time.—Gen. xxxviii. 8; *Burkhardt's Notes, Vol. I., pp.* 112, 113; *Keil's Archeol., Vol. II., p.* 66—in *Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. III., p.* 1800. *b.* Moses wisely regulated it. In the ceremony by which a brother was released from marrying his brother's widow, Moses provided a way to prevent marriage without love. The spitting "in his face" may be rendered, in presence of or before. "The Hebrew," says Gesenius, "means in front of or before."—*Ges. Heb. Lex., p.* 853. So in Ezekiel,

*זְנוּנִים—*zenunim.*

"before (same Hebrew* word for 'in the face') the wall."—Ezek. xlii. 12. So the Talmudists explain it. (*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. III., p.* 1799.) The reason for this ancient or Levirate custom is unknown. Some suppose it was to perpetuate a name; some, to retain the property in the family, etc. *c.* The brother who married his deceased brother's wife must be single. This is implied in the two brothers dwelling "together" (verse 5)—the unmarried brother finding a home with his married brother. The Pharisees all understood that in order to take his deceased brother's wife, the surviving brother must be single. See Matt. xxii. 24–28. Instead of this encouraging polygamy, as Underwood claims, it is clearly against it; for, if it had encouraged polygamy, aud polygamy had been the law and custom of the Old Testament, this law would have to read, "The *wives* of the dead;" "take them unto him to wife;" "the first-born they bear;" "let his brother's wives go up to the gate;" "and say, Our husband's brother;" "I like not to take them;" "then shall his brother's wives come unto him in the presence of the elders," etc. Moses, then, did not made this law; but he provided a way to release the living brother from marrying his deceased brother's wife if he did not love her, and, at the same time, condemned polygamy in providing for marriage to only one wife.

5. "ABRAHAM'S MARRIAGE TO HIS SISTER."—Gen. xii. 11; xx. 12. "This was true; probably in the same sense that Lot, Abraham's nephew, is called his brother (Gen. xiv. 14), being his brother's son; for that she was not the daughter of Terah, Abraham's father, is evident from Gen. xi. 31, where she is called daughter-in-law. It has been generally supposed, and with great probability, that Sarai was the same as Iscah (Gen. xi. 29), and was, therefore (by our way of reckoning),

* בְּפָנָיו.

the half-niece of Abraham."—*Gen., by T. J. Conant, D. D., p.* 55; also, Delitzsch Com. To this agree common Jewish tradition, Jerome, Josephus—*Ant., b.* 1., *ch.* 6, *sec.* 5. What can we think of the reliability of such men as Underwood who make Sarai out Abraham's "sister," as *we use the term sister,* when the record unequivocally shows she was not? Even if he had married his sister, the Bible does not approve his doing so. Prof. Robertson Smith, a skeptic, says: "Forbidden marriages, including that with a father's wife, seem to have been practiced pretty openly in Rome and Syria down to the fifth Christian century."—*Old Testament in Jewish Ch., p.* 68—*Seaside Library edition.* See Lev. xviii., where all unrighteous marriages are forbidden.

6. LOT AND HIS DAUGHTERS' INCESTUOUS ACT.—The account of this shows the Bible a pure book. *a.* The conduct of his daughters shows the fearful influence of vice, of raising children under bad influences, such as were in Sodom. *b.* It proves that the daughters knew God condemned it, and that their father would not approve of so heinous an act when sober. *c.* It shows the danger of using intoxicating drinks as a beverage. Their father did not mean to become intoxicated; but moderate drinking became the occasion of his intoxication. So intoxication leads to other evils. The Old Testament records this as a warning.

7. THE LAWLESSNESS RECORDED IN JUDGES, ESPECIALLY IN CHAPTERS XIX., XX., XXI.—*a.* We have seen that this lawlessness, everything wrong, is condemned by the Jewish law, etc. (Remember the rules of interpretation found in Chapter II. of this book.) *b.* Especially is this lawlessness condemned by the last verse of Judges: "And in those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right (not governed by law) in his *own* eyes."—Judges xxi. 25. The book teaches the fearful results of departing from God—of depart-

ing from the Bible. This people of Judges, like many now, "outgrew the Bible." They did what Franklin urged Tom Paine not to do—overthrew the influence of the Bible; "unchained the tiger" of human passion.

8. EXTIRPATION OF THE CANAANITES.—Deut. xx. 16–18. (Remember the rules of interpretation in Chapter II.; the purity of the law and kindness to enemies, shown in Chapter X. of this book.) *a.* To other nations the Jews were to offer conditions of peace. See *Josephus' Antiq. of Jews*, *b.* 4, *ch.* 8, *sec.* 41. *b.* With other nations, their wars were designed to be only in self-defense. "May you be laborious, etc., and thereby possess and inherit the land without wars."—*Josephus' Antiq.*, *b.* 4, *ch.* 8, *sec.* 41. Except the Canaanites and Midianites, the Jews were generally peaceful with all nations; sometimes too peaceful. Had the Jews been a little less intimate with other nations, they would not have so often fallen into idolatry. Though Deut. xx. is against only the Canaanites, we learn from Josephus that verses 10 and 11 were applicable to all their wars. The other verses could have application to only the Canaanites. *c.* That the unusual severity towards these nations was just is clear from several considerations. (The same apply to the Midianites.) *First.* They were extremely wicked. They, as a people, burned their children in honor of their gods. Lev. xviii. 21. As a people, they practiced sodomy, bestiality, and all loathsome vices. Lev. xviii. 22, 24; xx. 3. Such was their unmitigated depravity, that the land is represented as "vomiting out her inhabitants," and "spewing them forth, as the stomach disgorges a deadly poison."—Lev. xviii. 25, 27–30. God cut them off on account of these loathsome vices. *Second.* They were cut off on account of their evil influences. The above texts give this as the reason for cutting off these nations. (*a*) For this reason, no "covenant" or marriage

was permitted to be made with them. Deut. vii. 1–4. (*b*) The wisdom of prohibiting all friendly relations to these peoples—for excepting them—is shown from the disastrous consequences of the Israelites with the Moabites and Midianites. Numb. xxv. 1–9. To live among these beastly people without being defiled by them was utterly impossible. For this reason, it was said: "But of the cities of these people, which the Lord God doth give thee for an *inheritance* (*where you are to live*), thou shalt save *nothing alive that breatheth*: . . . . *that* they teach you not to do after their abominations."—Deut. xx. 16, 18. (*c*) The wisdom of commanding such destruction also appears in the consequences of its disobedence. Read Judges ii. 1–3; iii. 1–7. For both Israel and these doomed tribes this destruction was better; it saved Israel from evil, and saved countless generations of the others from being born into such abominable life and doom. *Third.* God commanded this destruction. Harless expresses a most certain fact: "To punish in the highest degrees, ... carries out the divine power of life and death in capital punishment. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find that abrogated which on this point—*i. e.*, capital punishment—was recognized as right under the Old. And I can understand, in no other than the most literal sense, what the apostle says, 'That the ruler bears not the sword in vain'" (Rom. xiii. 4).—*Sys. Chr. Eth.*, *p.* 409. If we could see no reason for such command, we know from his laws, nature, etc., that it was right—the same is true of all else to which objection is made. See Gen. xviii. 25. (See rules of interpretation in Chapter II.) *Fourth.* As the Moral Ruler of the world, as its Creator, he has the right to command anything that is right, however severe. Ps. vii. 8; ix. 8; l. 4; xcvi. 10; 1 Sam. ii. 10; Ps. xcvi. 13. [Please read these Scriptures to see that the Lord judges *righteously*.] *Fifth.* As *instruments* in the execution of the

judicial extermination of these nations, the Israelites were no more "murderers" than the officer who executes a criminal is a murderer. Both executions are executions by *authority* and *command* of government: the extermination of the Canaanites is by authority of the divine government; the execution of the "criminal" is by authority of the earthly government. *Sixth.* The execution of this divine command was in *no sense* an example or authority for such treatment of other nations. (*a*) Neither did the Jews nor any candid Biblical scholar ever understand it to be an example. (*b*) I have called attention to the fact that other Jewish wars (*i. e.*, authorized wars) were only in self-defense; and that the Jews were a peaceful people. See Numb. xxi. 21–35; Jer. xxi. 2. (*c*) When the temple was to be built—prefiguring the peaceful nature of Christ's kingdom—God said to David, "Thou shalt not build a house for my name: because thou hast been a man of war, and hast shed blood."—1 Chron. xxviii. 3; xxii. 8, 9. Not that these wars are therein condemned, but that war is condemned as a normal or permanent state of things. (*d*) The Old Testament taught Israel to look upon war as wrong; and to look for an age of peace. Compare 2 Chron. xvi. 9; Ps. lv. 21; lxviii. 30; cxx. 7; cxl. 2; Isa. ii. 4, 5; Ps. xxxvii. 11; lxxii. 3; cxlvii. 14; Isa. ix. 6; lv. 12; lx. 17, 18; Zech. viii. 16, 17, 19; ix. 10, 11. No one who reads the chapter of this book on relation to enemies; who considers the Old Testament voice against cruelty and homicide, and who carefully reads the Scriptures here referred to, can reasonably deny that the Jews were taught peace—the golden rule—with all, except the Canaanites and Midianites. War with them, as with us, was clearly a grievous necessity. *Seventh.* The execution of this command was an impressive lesson on the "exceeding sinfulness of sin" and the majesty and justice of the moral law—an inexpressible blessing to the race.

"What could be conceived so thoroughly fitted to implant an abiding conviction of the evil of idolatry and its foul abominations—to convert the abhorrence of these into a national, permanent characteristic, as their being obliged to enter on their settled inheritance by a terrible infliction of judgment upon its former occupants, for polluting it with such enormities? Thus the very foundations of their national existence raised a solemn warning against defection from the pure worship of God; and the visitation of wrath against the ungodliness of men accomplished by their own hands, and interwoven with the records of their history at its most eventful period, stood as a perpetual witness against them, if they should ever turn aside to folly. Happy had it been for them if they had been as careful to remember the lesson, as God was to have it suitably impressed upon their minds."—*Fairbairn's Typology, Vol. II., pp.* 465–471. "The language in which Mr. Carlyle (*Cromwell's Letters, Vol. II., p.* 53) characterizes the severe and bloody measures employed by Cromwell against the Irish insurgents, may be applied to the Israelites in executing the divine commission against the Canaanites: 'An armed soldier, solemnly conscious to himself that he is a soldier of God, the Just—a consciousness which it well beseems all soldiers, and all men, to have always; armed soldier, terrible as death, relentless as doom; doing God's judgments on the enemies of God! It is a phenomenon not of joyful nature; no, but awful; to be looked at with pious terror and awe.' Viewing the Israelites as the consciously commissioned ministers of heaven's vengeance upon an utterly corrupt and imbruted race, their case is lifted completely out of the common range of warfare and becomes *entirely unique*, no longer to be judged by the ordinary ethical standards. A late author, who could not be charged with fanaticism—Dr. Thomas Arnold (*Ser.* 4 *on* '*Wars of Israelites*'; see also *Stanley's Jewish Ch., Part* 1,

Lect. 11)—has the following defense of the Israelites and of their warfare of extermination: 'And if we are inclined to think God dealt hardly with the people of Canaan in commanding them to be so utterly destroyed, let us but think what might have been our fate, and the fate of every other nation under heaven, at this hour, had the sword of the Israelites done its work more sparingly. Even as it was, the small portion of the Canaanites who were left, and the nations around them, so tempted the Israelites by their idolatrous practices, that we read continually of the whole people of God turning away from his service. But had the heathen lived in the land in equal numbers, and, still more, had they intermarried largely with the Israelites, how was it possible, humanly speaking, that any sparks of the light of God's truth should have survived to the coming of Christ. . . . . The whole earth would have been sunk in darkness; and if Messiah had come, he would not have found one single ear prepared to listen to his doctrine, nor one single heart that longed in secret for the kingdom of God. But this was not to be; and, therefore, the nations of Canaan were to be cut off utterly. The Israelites' sword, in its bloodiest executions, wrought a work of mercy for all the countries of the earth to the very end of the world. . . . . In these contests on the fate of one of these nations of Palestine, the happiness of the whole human race depended. The Israelites fought not for themselves only, but for us. Whatever were the faults of Jephthah or of Samson, never yet were any men engaged in a cause more important to the world's welfare. . . . . Still they did God's work; still they preserved unhurt the seed of eternal life, and were the ministers of blessing to all other nations, even though they themselves failed to enjoy it.' The great German critic (who is a kind of a rationalist-skeptic), treating upon this topic (*Hist. Israel, Vol. II., p.*

237), has impressively said: 'It is an eternal necessity that a nation, such as the great majority of the Canaanites then were, sinking deeper and deeper into a slough of discord and moral perversity, must fall before a people roused to a higher life by the newly wakened energy of unanimous trust in a divine power.' Dr. Davidson (not 'orthodox') says (*Introd. Old Test., Vol. I., p.* 444): 'In a certain sense, the Spirit of God is a spirit of revenge, casting down and destroying everything opposed to the progress of man's education in the knowledge of the Lord.'"—*Alleged Discrep., pp.* 267–270.

Eighth. (*a*) The destruction of these nations was on the same principle that the antediluvians, (*b*) the Sodomites, Pharaoh and his hosts, etc., were destroyed. (*c*) They were destroyed on the same principle by which Divine Providence has always destroyed wicked men and nations. (*d*) They were destroyed on the same principle by which the wicked will be all finally cast into hell. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." "For *we* must *all* appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."—Heb. ix. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10. This will all be done in *righteousness*—"Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world *in righteousness.*"—Acts xvii. 31. Let the reader learn from the awful doom of these nations that a more awful doom awaits him if he dies in unbelief. Read what he who loved as never man loved says.—Matt. vii. 19–27; Mark xvi. 15, 16; Rev. xx. 11–15.

9. CHILDREN SLAIN FOR MOCKING THE PROPHET. 2 Kings ii. 23, 24. *a.* As an insult to an ambassador is an insult to the government which sent him, so this insult to Elisha was an insult to God who sent him. *b.* An insult to God is more heinous than an insult to an earthly power. *c.* As such, it

must bring greater punishment upon the insulting party. *d.* As Elisha had no power to cause these persons' deaths, God caused it. He only declared the curse that they must meet. *e.* As God cursed them, it was done in righteousness. (Remember what I have gone over, and the rules of interpretation in Chapter II.) *f.* These were "children" of the age of accountability.* "The word נְעָרִים—*nearim*—rendered children in Kings may, as a late rationalistic commentator admits, denote 'a youth nearly twenty years old.' Gesenius says precisely the same; adding that it is also applied to 'common soldiers,' just as we in English style them 'boys,' the 'boys in blue.' Fuerst gives, among other definitions, a person who is twenty years of age, a youth, a young prophet; generally, a servant of any kind, a young warrior. The same combination of words as above—*naar quatan*—is applied to Solomon after he began to reign, at some twenty years of age. Krummacher and Cassel translate the expression in the text, 'young people.' Hence, the theory that these young scoffers were really 'little children' at their play, is untenable. They were old enough and depraved enough to merit the terrible fate which overtook them."—*Alleged Discrep.*, *p.* 270.† See 2 Sam. xvii. 8; Prov. xvii. 12; Hosea xiii. 8; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; Lam. iii. 10; Amos v. 19, for how dangerous these bears were regarded. Adam Clarke thinks these may have been

* The same word is used, in feminine form, in 2 Kings v. 2, with the Hebrew little—קָטָן—*quatan*—for one old enough for a waiter upon "Naman's wife." And in Gen. xix. 11 the same word, for "little," is used to designate a part of the lawless young men; so used in 1 Sam. xx. 35; 1 Kings xi. 17. The same—נַעַר קָטָן—Hebrew phrase is applied to Hadad, who could flee and marry. 1 Kings xi. 19. It is certain that the Hebrew should be rendered so as to indicate those nearly or fully grown.

† נַעַר קָטָן *naar quatan*—to which Halley refers, designates Solomon as young, feeling his weakness. (1 Kings iii. 7.)

bears whose whelps these young fellows had just robbed, and which, "tracing the footsteps of the murderers of their young, thus came upon them in the midst of their insults, God's providence ordering these occurrences; . . . . justice guided them to the spot to punish the iniquity that had been just committed."—*Com., in loco. g.* Scoffing at the good is a heinous sin. A man may scoff at everything good. Virtue may be scoffed down and vice praised up. Webster defines scoff, "to show insolent ridicule." Such was the licentious infidel court of Charles the Second.

> "Truth from his lips prevailed with double sway,
> And *fools* who came to scoff, remained to pray."
> —GOLDSMITH.

A more terrible doom than these met awaits all scoffers at God's judgment. *h.* Much of what is said in justification of the destruction of the Canaanites, will apply to the case of these young fellows who were slain by the bears.

10. SLAYING OF SEDUCERS TO IDOLATRY. Deut. xiii. 6–9. *a.* This idolatry was a licentious, beastly and cruel worship. (See justification of extermination of the Canaanites in this chapter of this book.) Such seduction meant seduction to take their own children's lives to offer as a sacrifice, to prostitute their women, etc., to "lie with beasts." Lev. xviii. 21–24; xx. 7–21; xviii. 25, 28; Deut. vii. 1–4. How any one who is not in sympathy with these abominations, can regard them so light a thing as to call for cursing upon God for pronouncing such penalties upon those who should seduce others into them, I leave others to decide. *b.* Such seduction was high treason. Michaelis says (*Com. Laws of Moses, Vol. IV., p.* 11): "As the true God was the civil legislator of the people of Israel, and accepted by them as their King, idolatry was a crime against the State, and therefore just as

deservedly punished with death as high treason is with us. Whoever worshiped strange gods shook, at the same time, the whole fabric of the laws, and rebelled against him in whose name the government was carried on." Jahn says (*Hist. Heb. Commonwealth, p.* 19): "Whoever in the Hebrew nation, over which Jehovah was King, worshiped another god, or practiced any superstitions, by this very act renounced his allegiance to his King and deserted to another. He committed high treason, and was properly considered a public criminal. Whoever incited others to idolatry incited them to rebellion, and was a mover of sedition. Therefore, death was justly awarded as the punishment of idolatry, and its kindred arts, magic, necromancy and soothsaying; and also of inciting to idolatry."—*Alleged Discrep., p.* 226. Prof. Robertson Smith—in fact, a skeptic—says: "It is a crime, analagous to treason, to depart from him and sacrifice to other gods. As the Lord of Israel and Israel's land, the Giver of all good gifts to his people, he has a manifest claim on Israel's homage; and receives at their hands such dues as their neighbors paid to their gods; such dues as a king receives from his people" 1 Sam. viii. 15, 17.—*R. Smith's Lect. on the Old Test. in Jewish Ch., p.* 64—edition *Seaside Library.* The slaying of Baal's prophets (1 Kings xviii. 40) comes under this head. Keil says: "To infer from this act of Elijah's (equally condemned by the law which makes idolatry and seduction to idolatry of this nature and circumstance a high crime) the right to institute a bloody persecution of heretics, would . . . indicate a complete oversight of the difference between heathen idolaters and Christian heretics." Rawlinson says: "Elijah's act is to be justified by the express command of the law, that the idolatrous Israelites were to be put to death; and by the right of a prophet under the theocracy to step in and execute the law when the king failed to

do his duty."—*Alleged Discrep., p.* 265. *c.* Under the new dispensation, eternal death awaits all idolaters and all who seduce others from the truth. God reserves this for the judgment. See Matt. xviii. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Rev. xxi. 8; xxii. 15.

11. SLAYING OF SAUL'S BLOODY HOUSE. 2 Sam. xxi. 1–9. The law forbidding the punishment of children for their parents' sins, leaves us to conclude that these sons were participants in the crime for which they were slain. (See rules at close of Chapter II. of this book.) Read Deut. xxiv. 16; 2 Kings xiv. 5, 6.

Halley says: "In 2 Sam. xxi. 1 the designation, Saul's *'bloody house,'* intimates strongly that the men whom a recent writer deplores as 'innocent grandchildren,' were really participants in the crime of their departed progenitor. He had gone beyond the reach of earthly justice; hence, the penalty fell upon his surviving partners in treachery and blood. David Kimchi (*Mennasseh Ben Israel's Conciliator, Vol. I., p.* 167) tentatively, and Dr. Jahn (*Hist. Heb. Commonwealth, p.* 43) confidently, propose this very reasonable explanation of the case."—*Alleged Discrep., p.* 241. *The slaying of Achan's family is on the same principle.* Josh. vii. 24. The "sons and daughters" of Achan rejoiced in his sin, helped him conceal his crime. *The slaying of Ahab's sons and house, the slaying of the house of Ahaziah,* were doubtless on the same principle—all the slain *participants in the crime.* 2 Kings x. Though it seems that Jehu carried the matter too far—so as to violate the law of God. See Hosea i. 4. 1 *Sam. xv.* 1–3 *is explaincd partly as these cases, and partly as the cases of the Canaanites* and Midianites.

These cases—and any others of their class—teach that God will surely punish sin. They are fearful vindications of the MAJESTY OF THE LAW. Are *you* violating God's law?

While vindicating the Old Testament punishment of sin,

the subject requires a notice of infidel history on bloodshed —not punishment of sin. When infidels reigned, in the eighteenth century, in France, in a short time they murdered, in cold blood, without any justification, says Thiers, 1,022,351. Of these, 15,000 were inoffensive women; 22,000 priests; 1,120 died of premature child-birth; 3,400 in child-birth, and 348 from grief. See *Thiers' Hist. French Rev., Vol. III., p.* 475. Allison says of these infidel doings: "Women big with child; infants eight, nine and ten years of age, were thrown together into the stream, on the sides of which men armed with sabres were placed to cut off their hands, if the waves should throw them undrowned upon the shore. The citizens with loud shrieks implored the lives of their little innocents, and numbers of them offered to adopt them as their own; but though a few were granted to their urgent entreaty, the greater part were doomed to destruction. . . . The executioner died two or three days after with horror at what he himself had done." "Two persons of different sexes, generally an old man and an old woman, or a young man and a young woman,* bereft of every species of dress, were bound together, and being left in torture in that situation for half an hour, were thrown into the river. . . . . Such was the quantity of corpses accumulated in the Loire, that the water of the river was infected so as to render an ordinance forbidding the use of it by the inhabitants; and the mariners when they heaved their anchors frequently brought up boats charged with corpses. Birds of prey flocked to the shores and fed on human flesh, while the very fish became so poisonous as to induce the order of the municipality of Nantes prohibiting them from being taken by the fishermen." "People dared not express any opinion. They were afraid to visit their

* This by those who were horrified at the Old Testament treatment of women, etc!

friends, lest they might be compromised with them and lose liberty, and even life." Thiers says: "Every tenth day a revolutionary leader ascended the pulpit and preached atheism to the bewildered audience." They enthroned a harlot to represent their god. Wilson says: "The churches were closed [this is now an infidel wish], religion everywhere abandoned, and on all the public cemeteries was placed the inscription, 'Death is an eternal sleep.'" Buchner, a leading German infidel, says: "Materialism [infidelity] of the eighteenth century found its outward expression [the horrors just mentioned] in the French Revolution."—*Hist. Mater., pp.* 10, 11. For a faithful and fuller view of this infidel "Reign of Terror," see *Thiers' Hist. French Rev., Vol. III., pp.* 224–226, 475; *Allison's Hist. Europe, Vol. I., pp.* 271, 272; *Abbot's Hist. Rev., p.* 47, etc.; *Wilson's Out. Hist., pp.* 457, 844; *Carlyle's French Rev., Vol. II., p.* 206; *May's Const. Hist. Eng., Vol. II., p.* 42; *Farrar's Hist. Free Thought, pp.* 189, 190; *White's Hist. France, p.* 448; *Wuttke's Eth., Vol. I., p.* 322; *Shedd's Hist. Ch. Doc., Vol. I., p.* 218; *Le Play's Org. of Labor, pp.* 108, 380, 381, 384, 386, 399, 400; Burke, Pitt, etc. THIS IS THE ONLY TIME THAT INFIDELS EVER HAD ABSOLUTE CONTROL OVER ANY GOVERNMENT; *and history furnishes no such an horrible "control."*

Well did our great historian, Bancroft, say of infidelity: "Her garments are red with blood, and ruin is her delight." —*Hist. of United States, Vol. V., pp.* 22, 24. The reader will please note that the "Reign of Terror" is the natural offspring, as Buchner avows, of their *principles*, shown in Chapter III. of this book. While the Old Testament never took life except where the just and holy law required, in a few weeks these infidels murdered, "in cold blood," over one million of men, women and children, etc. Yet these men talked of the "cruelties," etc., of the Bible; so talk those

to-day who are of the very same doctrines! Let the mass of the people know these misrepresentations of the best book in the world; and WHO make them! Make them *face* their *principles* and *history*. Give them something else to do than —as Franklin advised Tom Paine to not do—to "unchain the tiger" of sin, by undermining the faith of the people in the Bible.

12. THE OLD TESTAMENT AND HUMAN SACRIFICES.—Inasmuch as infidels are ever charging the Bible with sanctioning human sacrifices, I will here confute the charge. They rely on Gen. xxii. 2; Joshua vii. 24, 25; Judges xi. 30–40; 2 Sam. xxi. 8, 9, 14, to sustain this charge. *a.* The law forbids human sacrifice; and the rules of interpretation, therefore, require that we differently interpret these Scriptures. (See rules of interpretation in Chapter II. of this book.) "And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Moloch." —Lev. xviii. 21. "Whosoever he be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that giveth any of his seed unto Moloch, he shall surely be put to death."—Lev. xx. 2; 2 Kings xvi. 3; xxi. 6; xxiii. 10; Jer. xix. 5; Ezek. xx. 30, 31; xxiii. 36–39; 1 Kings xi. 1–9; Deut. xviii. 10; 2 Kings xvii. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. How any man, who is not mad, with this law and all these Scriptures before him, could have ever charged the Bible with sanctioning such an abomination as human sacrifices, I leave others to discover. *b.* I have called attention to the fact that the Old Testament brands all taking of human life, except by accident or as a penalty for crime, as murder, to be wiped out by the death of the murderer. Deut. v. 17; Exod. xx. 13. *c.* The things to be sacrificed are *specifically designated*, so as to exclude human and all improper sacrifice. See Lev. i., ii., iii., iv., v., vi., vii., xvi., xxiii., etc., etc.—all the Bible. The maxim of law, "*Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*"—the expression of one

thing is the exclusion of another—compels us, by these laws of sacrifice, to exclude human sacrifices. *d.* The ethical nature of Old Testament ceremonies, sacrifices, etc., certainly excludes human sacrifices. *e.* "As to the case of Abraham offering Isaac, God's design was not to secure a certain *outward act*, but a state of mind, a willingness to" obey God; and, at the same time, to learn him a lesson of trust, to teach that God often leads us through darkness, where we can't see the *why*—even where, to our limited minds, all is contradiction, unreasonable, etc., but where he is with us to bring all out clear as the noon-day. Such was Job's trial; such the trial of Jesus, in Matt. iv. To undertake this teaching where we can see the way out, the whys and wherefores, is to lead us only by sight, and defeats the moral lesson and discipline in faith. But, thank God, he is ever teaching:

> "Judge not the Lord by *feeble sense*,
> But *trust* him for his grace;
> Behind a *frowning* providence,
> He *hides* a *smiling* face."*

"'The *principle* of this great trial,' says Dr. Thomas Arnold (*Miscel. Works, p.* 150), 'was the same which has been applied to God's servants in every age—whether they were willing to part with what they loved best on earth when God's service called for it.' Hengstenberg says (*Gennin-Pent., Vol. II., p.* 114): 'Verse 12 shows that satisfaction was rendered to the Lord's command when the *spiritual* sacrifice was completed.' In this view concur Warburton, Keil, Lange, Bush, Murphy, Wordsworth."—*Lange's Com. on Gen., pp.* 79, 80. So also

* The charge that the Bible sanctions human sacrifice is so shamefully and inexcusably false, that, no doubt, many of my readers are impatient at me for refuting it, and regard the refutation a waste of time. In this they may be right; but infidels not all being hopeless, I do this for their benefit.

Conant (Gen. xxii.), Adam Clarke (Gen. xxii.), Kurtz (*Hist. Old Cov., Vol. I., p.* 263), etc. Josephus well says: "It was not out of a desire of human blood that he was commanded to slay his son, nor was he willing that he should be taken from him whom he had made his father, but to try the temper of his mind."—*Antiq., b.* 1, *ch.* 13, *sec.* 4.

f. The slaughter of Achan's "sons and daughters" has been noticed in point "11" of this chapter. The stoning and burning them were only punishments and expressions of the detestation of sin and its terrible punishment. See Joshua vii. 15.

g. It is claimed that Lev. xxvii. 28, 29 authorizes human sacrifices. But, *first*, our rules of interpretation, at close of Chapter II. of this book—remembering such an abomination is so often condemned in the Bible—compel us to differently interpret this passage. *Second.* The Hebrew rendered devote חֵרֶם—*charam*—is used in two senses. It signifies "to consecrate, to devote unto God." Then, it signifies "to devote to destruction." "In the exterminating wars against the Canaanites, cities were often thus devoted; and these, when taken, were razed to the foundations, and the inhabitants, both man and beast, utterly destroyed; so as to prevent them from ever being redeemed from this vow."—*Ges. Heb. Lex., p.* 345. In the former sense of the word—in verse 28—*charam*—part of these were devoted; in the latter sense—verse 29—part, and in this part men whom Israel, in obedience to the Lord's command, had devoted—*charem*—to destruction. In Joshua vi. 17 *charem* is rendered "accursed;" and, in the eighteenth verse, in its various forms, it is rendered "accursed" twice and "curse" once. In Numb. xxi. 3 *charam* is rendered "destroyed"—speaking of the Canaanites "devoted" to destruction. In Exod. xxii. 20, we have יָחֳרָם

word rendered devote, meaning to destroy; so, also, in Numb. xxi. 2, 3; Deut. ii. 24; iii. 6; vii. 2; xiii. 15; xx. 17; Joshua ii. 10; vi. 21; viii. 26; x. 1, 35, 37, 39, 40; xi. 11, 12, 20, 21; Judges i. 17; xxi. 11; 1 Sam. xv. 3—in fact, in its various forms, this word is used more than fifty times for destroy. The word differs from the other Hebrew words for destroy, in that it carries the idea of destroying as a religious duty and devotion. Executing God's justice on these wicked men was devotion to God. Thus we see this devoted of men—אֲשֶׁר יֻחָרַם מִן הָאָדָם—*asher yacharam min haadam*—"which shall be devoted of men" (Lev. xxvii. 29), means "those accursed to death." Criminals condemned to death, and those of the nations to be destroyed, come under this irredeemable *cherem*—devoted.

h. The destruction of the "bloody house" of Saul is explained in "11" of this chapter. (2 Sam. xxi. 8, 9, 14.) The phrase in the Hebrew translated "before the Lord" (verse 9), means only that it was done with a belief that it was such a just retribution that Jehovah sanctioned it.

13. JEPHTHAH'S DAUGHTER DEVOTED.—*First.* Remember that the law and the whole Old Testament condemns human sacrifices; then apply our rules at close of Chapter II. of this book. *Second.* If Jephthah had done so horrible a thing, instead of being in Heb. xi. 32, he would have been cursed and condemned as all other Israelites were who so far departed from the law of God as to be guilty of this heathen abomination. See 1 Kings xvi. 3; xxi. 6; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 2, 6, where Ahaz and Manasseh are condemned for doing what some claim Jephthah did.* *Third.* "But the entreaty of the

* Of the assumptions that he acted rashly, etc., Keil and Delitzsch say: "But what we know of this brave hero by no means warrants any such assumptions. His acts do not show the slightest trace of impetuosity or rashness." "And, again, we have no right to attribute to

daughter, that he would grant her two months' time, in order that she might lament her *virginity* upon the mountains with her friends, would have been marvelously out of keeping with the account that she was to be put to death as a sacrifice. To mourn one's virginity does not mean to mourn because one has to die a virgin, but because one has to live and remain a virgin."—*Keil and Delitzsch—Com., in loco. Fourth.* If she had been mourning on account of her youth and premature death, "it would be altogether opposed to human nature that a child, who had so soon to die, should make use of a temporary respite to forsake her father altogether." *Fifth.* "It would no doubt be a reasonable thing that she should ask permission to enjoy life for two months longer before she was put to death; but that she should only think of bewailing her virginity, when a sacrificial death was in prospect, which would rob her father of his only child, would be contrary to all the ordinary feelings of the human heart." *Sixth.* "Inasmuch as the history lays special emphasis upon her bewailment of her virginity, this must have stood in some peculiar relation to the vow"—so much so that virginity, instead of death, was meant by the vow.* *Seventh.* "And this is confirmed by the expression, to bewail her virginity 'upon the mountains.' If life had been the question, the same tears might have been shed at home. But her lamentations were

---

him any ignorance of the law. . . . . The negotiations with the king of the Amorites show the most accurate acquaintance with the Pentateuch."—*Com. on Judges.*

* Another thing here as negative proof: "Human sacrifices do not even belong to heathenism generally; but to the darkest night of heathenism. They only occur among those nations which are the most thoroughly depraved in a moral and religious sense."—*Hengstenberg.* And Keil and Delitzsch remark that this remark can not be set aside by reference to Eusebius' statement from Porphyry. The Bible reader will here call to mind that only the basest nations in Bible times and basest Jewish rulers offered human sacrifices.

devoted to her virginity, and such lamentations could not be uttered in town, and in the presence of men. Modesty required the solitude of the mountains for these. The virtuous heart of the maiden does not open itself in the ears of all; but only in sacred silence does it pour out its lamentations of love." *Eighth.* "And so, again, the still further clause in the fulfillment of the vow, 'and she knew no man,' is not in harmony with a sacrificial death. This clause would add nothing to the description in that case, since it was already known that she was a virgin. The words only gain their proper sense if we connect them with the previous clause, he 'did with her according to the vow which he vowed,' and understand them as describing what the daughter did in fulfillment of the vow. The father fulfilled his vow upon her and she knew no man; *i. e.*, he fulfilled the vow through the fact that she knew no man . . . in a life-long *virginity*." *Ninth.* Auberlen's remarks, alone, ought to cast grave doubts upon the "human sacrifice" interpretation. "The history of Jeph thah's daughter," he says, "would hardly have been thought worth preserving in the Scriptures, if the maiden had been really offered in sacrifice; for, in that case, the event would have been reduced, at the best, into a mere family history, without any theocratic significance, though, in truth, it would rather have been an anti-theocratic *abomination*, according to Deut. xii. 31 (cf. chapter xviii. 9; Lev. xviii. 21; xx. 1–5). Jephthah's act would, in that case, have stood upon the same platform as the incest of Lot (Gen. xix. 30), and would owe its adoption into the canon simply to genealogical considerations, or others of a similar kind. But the very opposite is the case here; and, if from the conclusion of the whole narrative in chapter xi. 39, 40, the object of it is supposed to be simply to explain the origin of the feast that was held in honor of Jephthah's daughter, even this would tell against the ordin-

ary view. In the eye of the law the whole thing would still remain an abomination, and the canonical Scriptures would not stoop to relate and beautify an institution so directly opposed to the law."—Quoted by *Keil and Delitzsch. Tenth.* "But burnt offerings, that is to say, bleeding, in which the victim was slaughtered and burnt upon the altar, could only be offered upon the lawful altar at the tabernacle, or before the ark, through the medium of the Levitical priests, unless the sacrifice itself had been occasioned by some extraordinary manifestation of God; and that we can not for a moment think here." See Lev. i. 5; ii. 9, 16; iii. 5, 13, 16; iv. 4, 7, 10, 14, 18, 19, 26, 29, 31, for law of burning on the altar. "But is it credible that a priest or the priesthood should have consented to offer a sacrifice upon the altar of Jehovah which was denounced in the law as the greatest abomination of the heathen? This difficulty can not be set aside by assuming that Jephthah put his daughter to death, and burned her upon some secret altar, without the assistance and mediation of a priest; for such an act would not have been described by the prophetic historian as a fulfillment of the vow that he would offer a burnt-offering to the Lord, simply because it would not have been a sacrifice offered to Jehovah at all, but a sacrifice slaughtered to Moloch." So it would have been recorded if the priests, as in the cases of Ahaz and Manasseh, had helped him offer his daughter as a burnt-offering.—*Keil and Delitzsch's Com. on Judges and Ruth, pp.* 392–394.* *Eleventh.* "During the 'two months' which intervened between Jephthah's return and the supposed sacrifice, it is scarcely credible that the priests should not have interposed to prevent the barbarous deed, or that Jephthah himself should not have 'inquired of the Lord,' respecting a release from his vow."—

* These statements of Keil and Delitzsch I have divided into propositions, and somewhat paraphrased.

Halley. (See release from vows in Lev. xxvii. 1–8, etc.) *Twelfth.* One, of the moral *nature* that Jephthah was, certainly would have been prevented from the barbarous deed by that moral insight into right and wrong which is the invariable power of such souls as spoken of in Heb. xi. 32. As did David, on the impulse of the moment under passion, a good man may do a bad thing or deed; but not when in the religious state of mind and with the time for consideration, as was the case with Jephthah. *Thirteenth.* In verse 29, it is positively affirmed that Jephthah was in "the Spirit of the Lord" when he made the vow. As well believe God could cause sin as to, therefore, believe Jephthah burnt his daughter. *Fourteenth.* Verse 31 of Judges may be rendered, (*a*) "Shall surely be the Lord's, *or* I will offer it up for a burnt-offering." Dr. Davidson, an eminent Hebraist, says: "It can not be denied that the conjunction *'vav'* may be rendered *or.*"—*Introd. Old Test., Vol. I., p.* 476. Dr. Robinson says: "Gesenius, in 1 Kings xviii. 27, ... himself admits it is a disjunctive."—*Ges. Lex. Heb., p.* 266; *Ges. Thesaur., p.* 679. (*b*) Dr. Randolph, J. Kimchi and Auberlen render: "Shall surely be the Lord's, *and* I will offer *to* him a burnt-offering." Dr. Davidson says: "We admit that the construction is grammatically possible; for examples justify it, as Gesenius shows." "Either of these translations removes the difficulty."

The objection to this last rendering—that the Hebrew is the dative instead of the accusative—is groundless. For there are exceptions to the rules governing all languages. For example, the Greek in Acts ii. 38, where instead of ἕκαστος *αὐτῶν*—each of them—we have ἕκαστος *ὑμῶν*—"each," in third person, and "of you," in second person, while the verb *βαπτισθήτω* is third person. Were we to attempt to translate this by the rules of grammar, we would have something like:

"Be baptized each of them of (or which are of) you." But translators so translate this as to make "of you"—second person—agree with *hekastas*—each, which is in the third person. But in the case before us no such abruptness is necessary to render, "I will offer *to him* a burnt-offering;" for Gesenius clearly shows (see *Heb. Gram.*, *sec.* "138, 2") that there are not a few exceptions where the accusative is equivalent to the meaning or use of the dative. I believe this rendering—"offer *to* him"—is the true rendering. Some other renderings need correction in this connection. In verse 39, we should render, "She knew no man and it [*i. e.*, to vow daughters to perpetual virginity—Exod. xxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 22, in ministering at the tabernacle] was a law in Israel." Verse 40—"From year to year the daughters in Israel came to [or praise] celebrate the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite," etc. Gesenius defines תָּנָה—*tanah*—rendered by our version "lament"—"to praise, rehearse, celebrate." So do Profs. Harper (*Heb. Voc.*, *p.* 106), Young, Fuerst, and others. In chapter xi. 5 our version renders it rehearse, instead of "lament." The Hebrew verbs for lament are: קוֹן, סָפַד, נָהָה, אָנָה—*ana*, *nahah*, *saphad*, *qun*; and to these may be added others, as בָּכָה—*bakah*. The English reader would naturally infer that the word rendered by our version "lament" is one of the same meaning, if not the same word, as the one rendered "bewail" in verse 37. But the word there rendered is בכה—*bakah*, which really means "bewail." Jephthah's daughter being sacrificed to the Lord by perpetual virginity, to minister at the tabernacle—she was his only child (verse 34)—cut off all hope of the perpetuation of his family. Besides, the sacrifice of all hope of ever becoming a mother was the greatest sacrifice which a daughter of Israel could make. Because of this, there was the bewailing of her virginity (verse 37). Had the wailing been because of her death, it would more natur-

ally read, "Bewail my *death*." Besides, who ever heard or read of such an *ante-mortem* funeral! The noble act—of self-sacrifice to the Lord—which verse 40 records, was celebrated by "the daughters of Israel" going "yearly to celebrate [or praise] the daughter of Jephthah." But how unnatural, how absurd, to suppose that they "went yearly" to praise the daughter of Jephthah for helping to commit the fiendish crime of human sacrifice! There is every philological, historical and common-sense evidence against any such crime as human sacrifice in the case of Jephthah's daughter.

To remove the supposition of his offering his daughter as a burnt-offering, it is only necessary to show that a different translation and interpretation can be fairly made. Our rules in Chapter II., and the law condemning such an abomination, compel us to adopt the position that Jephthah did not offer a human sacrifice. So Bush, Cassel, Delitzsch, Keil, Grotius, Lange, the Kimchis, Le Clerc, Lilienthal, Hengstenberg, Saalschutz, Schudt, Houbigant, Waterland, Levi Ben Gersom, Bechai, Drusius, de Dieu, Bishop Hall, Dr. Hales, Adam Clarke, Richter, and many other eminent biblical scholars, agree that Judges does not say he sacrificed his daughter; and they agree that he did not do so. See *Haley's Alleged Discrep., p.* 239, and others.

Only her virginity was mourned. Inasmuch as she was his only child, the only hope of his posterity; inasmuch as, in the estimation of a Jew, to have no posterity and remain a virgin was a great loss, there was much wailing. She was probably devoted to perpetual service in the tabernacle. See Exod. xxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. i. 11; ii. 22. It "was a custom in Israel" (Judges xi. 39) to mourn her virginity. It is, then, clear that there is not a shadow of justification for the charge that the Bible sanctions human sacrifice.

14. DAVID, "THE MAN AFTER GOD'S OWN HEART." (1 Kings

xv. 3, 5; xiv. 8; xi. 33, 34; Acts xiii. 22; 1 Sam. xiii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 20, 21. *a.* The emphatic condemnation of murder, adultery, etc., in the Scriptures, compels us to regard these commendations of David as commendations only so far as he did right. (See rules of interpretation in Chapter II., which must be kept in mind.) *b.* Acts, Samuel and Psalms are "not absolute, but describe the character of David in comparison with Saul. The latter was rejected for his disobedience and impiety; David, on the contrary, ... performed his commands as they were made known to him." —*Hackett on Acts xiii.* 22. Besides, 1 Sam. xiii. 14 informs us that these commendations were in David's early life. *c.* The commendations in later life are limited by other Scriptures. (See rules of interpretation.) 1 Kings limits it by "save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite."—1 Kings xv. 5. 1 Kings xi. 33, 34 and xiv. 8 are expressly made in comparison with the kings mentioned in the context—a comparative commendation only. Nothing can be more reckless than the disregard of the rules of interpretation by which these commendations are made to appear as unqualified. Read 2 Sam. xxiv. 10; xii. 1–15, and compare Ps. li. and xxxi. The sacred historian presents the outrage of his daughter Tamar (2 Sam. xiii.); the revolt and death of his most beloved son Absalom (1 Sam. xv.); the rebellion by which David was sent forth a barefooted wanderer, cursed and despised (2 Sam. xvi. 7, 8; xvii.); the ruin of the kingdom of Israel through his son Solomon, etc.; Ahithophel, the grandfather of Bathsheba, the main supporter of Absalom's rebellion (2 Sam. xvi. 20–23); the disgrace which Absalom brought upon his father with his inferior wives (2 Sam. xvi. 22); the death of his infant son (1 Sam. xii. 14–23); the murder of his eldest son Ammon (1 Sam. xiii. 27–30); all, and more, as the result of David's sins. God inspired Nathan (2 Sam. xii. 9–14) to tell

David that, though personally forgiven—saved from death, the penalty of his crime, etc.—as a lesson to him and others, as a vindication of the divine law and a curse on sin, "THEREFORE, *the sword shall never depart from thy house; because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy wife.* Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine house [*i. e.*, permit it], and I will take thy wives before thine eyes and give them unto thy neighbor [*i. e.*, permit it], and he shall lie with the wives in the sight of this sun. For thou didst it secretly: but I will do this thing [*i. e.*, permit it] before all Israel and before the sun. . . . . Because of this deed, thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme [*i. e.*, do the evils above mentioned]; the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die." In 2 Sam. xvi. 11, David recognizes his troubles as the infliction of a just God for his sin. This sin of David—common to oriental monarchs of that and of our own time, and not regarded wrong by them and their religions—is visited with such terrible retributions as to impress upon all the righteousness of the law and to make us stand in awe before the *justice* and righteousness of the Judge of all the earth. As one sin leads to another, etc., this is also a scathing rebuke on all of David's sins. Well does Stanley remark, concerning the expression commending David: "This expression has been perhaps too much made of."—*Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. I., p.* 565.

But not to indicate the other side of David's character would be an equal injustice. *a.* He was a man of a tender, generous and forgiving disposition. *First.* Though hunted like a fox, because of only jealousy on Saul's part, when Saul's life was in his hands, that, too, when seeking David's life, David refused to injure him—"The Lord forbid that I should do this thing unto my master." For cutting "off the skirt of Saul's

robe," with no intention to injure him, "David's heart smote him." (1 Sam. xxiv. 5, 6.) Saul was so deeply moved at the magnanimity of David, that "he lifted up his voice, and wept. And he said to David, Thou art more righteous than I: for thou hast rewarded me good, whereas I have rewarded thee evil. And thou hast shewed this day how that thou hast dealt well with me: forasmuch as when the Lord had delivered me into thine hand, thou killedst me not."—1 Sam. xxiv. 16–18. *Second.* A second time David refuses to injure Saul, when, seeking his life, he fell into his power. David would neither injure him himself nor let his men do so, though they insisted on doing it. Here Saul was again so moved by the nobleness of David's heart, that he said: "I have sinned: return, my son David; for I will no more do thee harm, because my soul was precious in thine eyes this day: behold, I have played the fool, and have erred exceedingly. . . . . Blessed be thou, my son David." See 1 Sam. xxvi. Where is the man now living who would have spared Saul's life in this, even, first instance. Yet David not only then spared his life, but did so in the second! *Third.* His forbearance and tenderness towards Shimei. Shimei cursed him and deserved death; yet he so long saved his life. Compare 2 Sam. xvi. 5–10 with xix. 16–23 and 1 Kings ii. 8. David's tenderness here led him to violate what seems to have been the law. (Exod. xxii. 28; xx. 7; 2 Sam. xix. 21. *Fourth.* In David's forgiveness to all engaged in this most heinous, provoking rebellion. (2 Sam. xix. 22.) *Fifth.* David's care to preserve Absalom—than whom no traitor ever more deserved death—and his grief over his death. (2 Sam. xviii. 5, 32, 33.) Here his tenderness again carried him into sinful grief. (2 Sam. xix. 1–6.) Exposed himself to the charge, "Thou lovest thine enemies and hatest thy friends" (2 Sam. xix. 6)—a charge to which not many to-day are sub-

ject. These incidents prove David to have been of a very tender, generous and forgiving disposition. *b.* David was a man of high conceptions of right and justice, and of a very tender conscience. No hardened criminal could have ever uttered that noble confession—the 51st Psalm. *c.* No criminal could have ever written the 119th Psalm, nor the 8th, 15th, 19th, 23d, 24th, 26th, 33d, 39th, etc., Psalms. These Psalms show the mind of a man, though often fallen and bruised, yet as often rising again, and striving for the perfect mark. David's sin against Uriah, harem, etc., was a custom of oriental monarchs of his time; it is so with them today. Our public men of our own country are often loose men. This helped lead David into such sins. But while the Jewish law compelled him to do it *secretly*, then repent, etc., other monarchs and their people thought nothing of such crimes, and gloried in their open commission.—See Matt. xiv. 3–11.

As to Nabal's death (1 Sam. xxv. 38), the record is that the Lord smote him. Ewald, the great Rationalist German critic, admits that David had nothing to do with his death.

Carlyle, a superior judge of character and who is not hurt with strict "orthodoxy"—though not an infidel—says: "Who is called 'the man after God's own heart'? David, the Hebrew king, had fallen into sins enough—blackest crimes; there was no want of sin. And, therefore, unbelievers sneer, and ask, 'Is this your man according to God's own heart?' The sneer, I must say, seems to me but a shallow one. What are faults, what are the outward details of a life, if the inner secret of it, the remorse, temptations, the often-baffled, never-ending struggle of it, be forgotten. . . . . David's life and history, as written for us in those Psalms of his, I consider to be the truest emblem ever given of a man's moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest souls will ever discover in it the faithful

struggle of an earnest human soul towards what is good and best. Struggle often baffled—sore baffled—driven as into entire wreck; yet a struggle never ended, ever with tears, repentance, unconquerable purpose, begun anew."—*Heroes and Hero Worship, p.* 72—quoted in *Smith's Bible Dict., Vol. I., p.* 565.

While under this head, I will notice 2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3.* "If our version of the text from Chronicles is correct, David merely punished the Ammonites for the terrible cruelties which, at a previous period, his fellow-countrymen had suffered at their hands. Compare 1 Sam. xi. 2; Amos i. 13. Henderson, referring to these cruelties, says: 'The object of the Ammonites was to effect an utter extermination of the Israelites inhabiting the mountainous regions of Gilead, in order that they might extend their territory in that direction.' According to a Jewish tradition, David slew the Moabites (2 Sam. viii. 2) because they had treacherously murdered his parents, who had been confided to their care (*Michaelis' Mos. Laws, Vol. I., p.* 334, 335). Wahner, however, gives these explanations, 'according to which none of the vanquished Moabites were put to death' (*Life of David, Vol. II., pp.* 227–238). The probability is that *our version* of both texts of the first series, as well as the *original* of the second of those texts, is incorrect. Dr. Davidson says: 'According to the present reading of Samuel, the meaning could not be, he *put them to.* Nor could it be, he *put them under;* but only, he *put them among or between.*' Chandler, Dantz, Adam Clarke, and others, take the meaning to be that David enslaved the Ammonites, putting them to servile labor in the midst of suitable implements, saws, harrows, axes and the like. The word *vayyasar*—he sawed—in Chronicles, may be a copyist's blunder for *vayyasem*—he put—as in Samuel. The latter word is

* See origin of Ammonites and Moabites in Gen. xix. 37, 38.

found in seven of the MSS. collated by Dr. Kennicott (none against these seven discovered). The close resemblance of the two words, especially if the final letter mem were imperfectly formed, accounts for the error of the transcriber. We, therefore, submit that there is no evidence that David put the Ammonites to the torture. . . . . If he killed any, it may have been, as Keil suggests, simply the 'fighting men that were taken prisoners.'"—*Alleged Discrep., pp.* 264, 265.

In addition to the above sound criticism, I submit, *a*, that punishing men under saws, harrows, axes, and burning them in brick kilns, are methods of punishment unknown to the Jewish law and unknown to Jewish history. In fact, such a variety of ridiculous methods of punishments is rare, if not unknown to any history. How could men be tortured to death with a harrow? *b.* The tender character of David forbids any such wholesale cruel punishments, unless he had the most heinous, justice-deserving criminals to punish; then he would have punished them by a different method. (Remember rules of interpretation in Chapter II.)

15. The imprecatory Psalms.—See Ps. xxxv. 6, 8; lv. 15; lxix. 24, 27; lxxxiii. 17; cix. 6–10, 12, 13, 18, 19. *a.* That these Psalms are "mere spite," the tender, forgiving character of the writer David forbids. Can one who showed such surpassing freedom from such a spirit, in his relations to Saul, etc., have ever been filled with "spite" so as to have written these Psalms in such a spirit? *b.* Jesus receiving these Psalms as holy forbids us receiving them as unholy. Jesus read them, prayed them, sung them and lived them. See Luke xx. 42; xxiv. 44–46. On Matt. xxvi. 30, Adam Clarke says: "As to the hymn, we know from the universal consent of Jewish antiquity that it was composed of Psalms cxiii., cxiv., cxv., cxvi., cxvii. and cxviii." Bengel, G. W. Clarke, *Comp. Commentary*, and commentators generally, are agreed

that Jesus here sung Psalms. These very Psalms are partly imprecatory. Are we better and wiser than Jesus, that we may condemn these Psalms while he so unqualifiedly indorsed them? *c.* There are no severer curses in any of these Psalms than are the words of Jesus. See Matt. xxv. 41; xxiii. 13–27; Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47; Mark iii. 29; John v. 29; Mark xvi. 16; iii. 5; ix. 43–48; Matt. xiii. 42; xviii. 7–9, etc. Certainly no severer curses are in Psalms than these passages referred to, recorded from the lips "of the meek and lowly Jesus." *d.* There are no severer curses in any of these Psalms than are found in the writings of the apostles. See 1 Cor. xvi. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 14; Rom. i. 18, 32; vi. 23; Jude 7; Rev. xv., xvi., xvii., xviii. and xix. *e.* The just in the intermediate world cry for vengeance. (Rev. vi. 10.) *f.* Nothing is more evident than that these imprecatory Psalms are in the strictest harmony with both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures. *g.* If we would remember that "*All* (these Psalms, too) Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for *reproof*, for *correction*, for instruction in *righteousness:* that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto good works" (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17), no such imaginary difficulties could occur to any of our minds. These Psalms are but the voice of God from the Psalmist's lips, pronouncing upon wicked men the curse of an outraged law. *h.* The Psalmist uttered these Psalms as king in Jehovah's place. *i.* Some of them, at least—likely all—were prophetic. The 109th, against Judas and Ahithophel, were pronunciations and prophecies of the terrible justice which they both met. See 2 Sam. xvi. 21; xvii. 23; Acts i. 20. *j.* As a good man, identified with Jehovah, the Psalmist naturally expressed the curse or feelings of Jehovah against these wicked men. Catiline had an insight into this natural condition of every citizen, when he said: "*Nam idem velle atque idem nolle, eademum firma*

amicitia est"—(*Sallust's Catiline*, 20, 4—quoted)—an identity of wishes and aversions, this alone is true friendship. Such was David's friendship to God: "Do I not hate them, O Lord, that hate thee. . . . I count them *mine* enemies." A good man, identified with any good government, can not help, and ought not if he could, feeling that all enmity and thrusts against that government are against himself. *k.* As every good man says amen to the curse of the law—its punishment—on the transgressor, so the Psalmist wrote these imprecatory Psalms. Who ever felt like reproaching an outraged community for wishing the severest curse or punishment against the outlaw? Who feels like reproaching the laws of any nation because, like the imprecatory Psalms, they so severely condemn and punish the transgressor? All sound sentiment and literature are full of the sentiment of these Psalms. Who ever reproached the immortal Milton for writing:

> "Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
> Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
> Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
> When all our fathers worshiped stocks and stones," etc.
> —*Poem on Late Massacre in Piedmont.*

"A renowned professor, who, as Germany thinks, has done more for New England theology than any man since Jonathan Edwards, was once walking in this city with a clergyman of radical faith, who objected to the doctrine that the Bible is inspired, and did so on the ground of the imprecatory Psalms. . . . . The doubter could not be satisfied. The two came at last to a newspaper bulletin, on which the words were written—the time was at the opening of our civil war: 'Baltimore to be shelled at twelve o'clock.' 'I am glad of it,' said the radical preacher. 'And so am I,' said his companion; 'but I hardly dare say so, for fear you will say I am

uttering an imprecatory Psalm.'"—*Trans., by Joseph Cook, pp.* 76, 77. A good man must say amen to the justice of the law upon his own son, if that son be a terrible outlaw. Of course, frail and as subject to feeling as we are, it would be hard to do so. But if we are what we ought to be, it would be easier to say amen than, by murmuring against the just sentence of the law, to become partakers of our son's crimes. So the righteous will rejoice in an eternal hell as but the expression and vindication of the righteous law against sin. So the Psalmist wrote these terrible Psalms. To have written their opposite, on these wicked men, would have only proved him a child of hell; for only such can say "peace" to the wicked. Wherever these Psalms pronounce curses upon the children of these wicked persons, it is done by the divinely inspired foreknowledge that their children's *minds* will partake of their own wickedness. *I.* Wherever there is any hope, these Psalms pray these judgments upon men for their own good: "Fill their faces with shame; *that* they may seek thy name, O Lord." See Ps. lxxxiii.

Of course, the reader is to remember that these Psalms are poems, and, according to oriental style, are strongly figurative. Bold metaphors and startling hyperboles are the characteristics of oriental style, even in the every-day life of shepherds. A learned writer says: "A poetic spirit pervades all their works," even to-day. See *De Wette's Introd. Old Test.; Lect. on Heb. Poet., by Lowth; Psalms, by Conant*, etc., etc. Though not "orthodox," Max Muller, speaking of the oriental style, etc., says: "If we *willfully* misinterpret the language of the ancient prophets; if we persist in understanding their words in the outward and material aspect only," "the fault is ours, not theirs." "I believe it can be proved that more than half of the difficulties in the history of religious thought owe their origin to this constant misinterpretation of ancient lan-

guage by modern language, of ancient thought by modern thought."—*Lect. on Science of Religion, p.* 25.

16. SACRIFICE FOR—"CURSE ON"—CHILD-BIRTH. Lev. xii. 6, 7. This can not possibly imply any sin in child-birth. *a.* God is represented in the Old Testament as ordaining child-birth; the Old Testament speaks of it as a blessing. "Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thy house."—Ps. cxxviii. 3; Gen. i. 28; xiii. 16; xvi. 10; Ps. cxiii. 9; Deut. vii. 12–14. The infidel objection would make Deut. vii. 14 read: "Thou shalt be cursed (instead of blessed) above all people: there shall not be male or female barren among you." *b.* The Redeemer of the world is promised and represented as being given through child-birth. See Isa. vii. 14. *c. His* mother complied with the law in Lev. xii. 6, 7. See Luke ii. 22. Yet she is pronounced, "*Blessed* among women."—Luke i. 28. With these facts before him, no man can interpret Lev. xii. 6, 7 by the laws of interpretation in Chapter II. of this book, and say that law teaches that child-birth is a sin. While it does not devolve upon me to explain what this law does mean, I do so. As a mercy, God, after the fall, made child-birth a sorrow, to remind our race that sin has cursed the most sacred things of life and that we are born in sin. (Gen. iii. 16.) So David, not as a reproach to his mother nor as an intimation that child-bearing is a sin, but as an expression of the curse of sin, and of our birth in sin, said: "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."—Ps. li. 5. See here Eph. ii., latter clause of third verse, and John iii. 3–7. As the mother in child-birth was especially reminded of the curse of sin, she was required to make this atonement—not for having the child, but for her sins; at the same time, to thank God for her safe delivery and the blessing of another gift from his hand; for, through the atonement, we not only are forgiven our sins, but through

it we thank and praise God. Leyrer says (on Lev. xii.) that this and all other rites of purification were intended "to foster the constant humiliation of fallen man; to remind him, in all the leading processes of natural life—generation, birth, eating, disease, death—how everything, even his own bodily nature, lies under the curse of sin; that so the law might become a schoolmaster to bring him unto Christ, and awaken and sustain the longing for a Redeemer from the curse which has fallen upon his body."—Quoted in *Alleged Discrep.*, *p.* 230. So Clarke and others. Read Lev. xii., xiii., xiv., xv., etc.

The mother was regarded by the law as unclean for a longer time, when she bare a "maid" child, not as a reflection on women (see chapter on women, and the rules of interpretation at close of Chapter II. of this book), but as a reminder of sin; for the longer time for purification for a "maid" child recalled the mother's thoughts to the first transgression in Eden. The atonement or purification for a birth of either a son or a daughter, led the mother to think of Gen. iii. 16 and the fall; but, having her attention drawn to women in the history of the fall by a longer time required for her purification when she had a "maid" child, she was especially led to think of what a cursed thing is *sin*. Of course, the interest of the husband in the birth of his child, and his love to his wife, led him to follow with intense interest its mother through this atonement and purification; and, thus, he was taught the same lesson—the curse of sin. How sad that any one should pervert this sacrifice into a thrust at child-bearing, and at woman; that, too, in the face of Old Testament blessing on them! Why does not some perverter charge the Bible with making it a sin to be a high priest and enter the tabernacle, because the high priest was required to make an "atonement" before he went "into the holy place"? See Lev. xvi. 3, 6.

17. GIVING AND SELLING ANIMALS TO OTHERS FOR FOOD WHICH HAD "DIED OF THEMSELVES."

I reply, *first*, why, in the face of the love and the good treatment to even enemies, required by this same Jewish law (see rules of interpretation in Chapter II. of this book), should this be taken to mean that the Jews were to give or sell "bad meat"? In the *second* place, the absurdity of interpreting this to mean "bad meat" lies upon its very face. *a.* For while it is possible, but not probable, that persons might be so destitute as to accept "bad meat," that any would *buy* it is too absurd a thing to be entertained for a moment. *b.* There would be no need to forbid the Jews to eat such meat. *Third.* The law concerning this meat commanded that the "stranger that sojourneth with you" (Numb. xv. 16; Lev. xix. 33, 34, *et seq.;* Acts x. 35; Lev. xix. 18; see first of Chapter VIII. of this book) should be treated well. *Fourth.* Concerning the "stranger that sojourneth with you," he was to be the subject of the excellent charity laws of the Jews. See Chapter VIII. of this book. *Fifth.* The Hebrew for "dieth of itself"—נְבֵלָה—*nebelah*—is not a verb but a noun, meaning a carcass. But the idea it derives from its verb seems to be that which, by any kind of accident, etc., had died, immediately, or some time after the accident. In the following Scriptures it is applied to such as had been slain: Lev. xi. 8, 11, 24, 27, 28, 40; Deut. xxviii. 26; Joshua viii. 29; 1 Kings xiii. 24; 2 Kings ix. 37. It is rendered "dieth of itself" five times; once, "dead carcass;" once, "dead of itself;" and thirty-three times, "carcasses" or "carcass." *Nebelah* is not the Hebrew word for die a natural death, nor is any of its forms the word for a corpse from such a death. The Hebrew מוּת —*muth*—means to die; מָוֶת—*maveth*—death, etc., is the family of words for such as die a natural death. The rendering should be, "any animal that died of violence;" *i. e.*, anything

that died of any hurt. The word refers to the same idea to which πνικτὸν—*peniktou*—in Acts xv. 20 refers—"strangled." Both words signify animals not bled. Hence, as the Jew was forbidden to eat blood, because it was offered as atonement, and because eaten or drank as heathen worship (Ps. xvi. 4; Ezek. xxxii. 25), they could only sell or give all meat, that was not well bled, to those who were not Jews. To be sure, no one could eat it if it lingered long after its death-wound. See Lev. xix. 26; vii. 26; iii. 17; Deut. xii. 16; 1 Sam. xiv. 32; Ezek. xliv. 7, 15. These Scriptures fully explain why the carcass, from violence, must not be food for the Jew.

18. "BORROWING" OF THE EGYPTIANS WITH NO "INTENTION OF RETURNING." Exod. iii. 22. The reply to this, "borrow" is undoubtedly a false rendering of שָׁאַל—*shaal*. Gesenius defines it, "To require, to demand," etc.—*Ges. Lex. Heb.* The very men who here render it borrow, in eighty-eight instances render it "ask"; in one, asking; in six, "demand". The Septuagint renders it αιτησει—*aiteesei*—shall ask; the Vulgate *postulabit*, shall demand. In Exod. iii. 22; xi. 2; xii. 35, it should be rendered ask or demand. The Jews had been cruelly enslaved; had received little or nothing for their labor; God commanded the Jews to ask these jewels, etc., and he moved—as he did Pharaoh's heart—the hearts of the Egyptians to grant the request.

I have now taken up the main objections which are peddled over the country. To nearly all, the "basis," etc., of ethics, with its essentials, as presented in Chapters III. and IV., would have been sufficient answer. Any other ethical "difficulties" can be worked out by the rules in Chapter II. of this book, after the practice in their application which the reader, who has carefully followed me in this investigation, has received.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONCLUSION.

1. We have given a brief examination of the basis of Old Testament Ethics. *a.* In this examination we have seen that the basis of Old Testament Ethics is morally faultless, spotless and holy. *b.* We have seen that, outside of the New Testament and uninfluenced by Bible light, no religion, philosophy, or ethical writer has ever approached, in ethics, the ethics of the Old Testament as manifested in its ethical basis. In this respect, Old Testament Ethics is, really, incomparably above all non-Bible ethics.

2. What is true of the basis of Old Testament Ethics, we have seen to be equally true of its structural and practical ethics.

And here, as I have omitted the matter, and as it may as well appear here, I notice the moral teaching of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. The books of this Apocrypha are "not equal in authority to the sacred books: they did not belong to the Hebrew canon; they were written after the extinction of prophecy; they are not quoted in the New Testament (the book of Enoch referred to by Jude is not among the Apocrypha); the most learned among the Christian fathers—Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome—excluded them from the canon in its strictest sense, although they made frequent use of them; they contain some Jewish superstition, and furnish the Roman Catholics proof-texts for their doctrines of purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the meritoriousness of good works."

—*Bissell on the Apocrypha, p.* 1—the latest and most learned authority on the Apocrypha. These books are a mixture of history, Bible doctrine, Grecian philosophy, Persian religion and Jewish speculations, etc. Says Bissell: "The Apocryphal writers, moreover, conceived of sin, as far as they considered the matter at all, as something appertaining to the outward conduct, a transgression of the acknowledged standards; and seem rarely, if ever, to have reached the more radical conception of its being a want of inward conformity to the divine will. The underlying motive, the governing purpose of the heart, being for the most part left out of account, and the consequences of one's conduct being thought of simply in relation to individual happiness. . . . . At the same time, too, as might have been expected on the basis of this low moral plane, ... Razis was justified in committing suicide, if, persecuted for righteousness' sake, he were in danger of falling into the hands of his enemies; and a Judith might invoke the blessings of God on her deceptions and prostitute her person for the weal of her fatherland. Minute directions are given how one is to behave in society, how to eat to excess without evil consequences, and to preserve the health through avoidance of melancholy; but love to God, in any other sense than reverence or veneration, seems scarcely to have been thought of. He was the happy man who lived to see the death of his enemies, and by his good deeds, especially the giving of alms, had purchased from heaven the forgiveness of sins and won a permanent place in the memories of men."—*Bissell on the Apocrypha, p.* 46.

The immeasurable ethical inferiority of such ethics to Old Testament Ethics calls for no remarks here. That a people with Old Testament training should fall so far below their own ethical text-book as to write such ethics as the Apocrypha contains, only deepens the conviction of the incompa-

rable superiority of Old Testament Ethics. Yet we can not do justice to the subject without here stating the fact, that the ethics of the Old Testament Apocrypha is superior to all ancient or modern ethics which are outside of the Bible or Bible influences. The evidences of this superiority are too numerous to here mention. No doubt this superiority is due to the ethical impress which Old Testament Ethics had made upon its writers. And, in this superiority of Apocryphal ethics to all but Bible ethics, is another evidence of the superiority of the Old Testament to all heathen and infidel ethics.

3. I here quote a few—mostly infidel—infidel and half-infidel writers to the beauty of Old Testament Ethics. They cover the various points which we have investigated. Dr. Henry W. Bellows: "The Bible owes its continued authority and influence to the fact that it really *contains* the word of God; that in its various records flows down the full and vigorous river of God's grace and truth, in the history of a race peculiarly and providentially fitted to receive special communications from on high. Nothing can ever change or destroy the sublime merits and religious influence of the Mosaic dispensation; nothing outlives the strains of David's glorious harp; nothing takes the place of Isaiah's exalted prophecies."

Mr. Weiss: "The prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah can be matched by no other literature in this world." Mr. Weiss is an extreme infidel. Rousseau: "Peruse the books of philosophers, with all their pomp and diction; how meager, how contemptible are they when compared with the Scriptures. The majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration." So is Rousseau an extreme infidel. Taken from *What Noted Men Think of the Bible.* Prof. Goldwin Smith: "All nations worshiped God by sacrifice and through outward forms till the mind of man had been raised high enough to worship in spirit and in truth. The Hebrew lawgiver did not originate

sacrificial rites, but he elevated and purified them against the most horrible aberrations as to the nature of God and the mode of winning his favor and averting his wrath, as all who know the history of sacrifices, Eastern or Western, must perceive. The scape-goat has been and is a subject of much mockery to philosophers. Moses did not introduce that symbolic way of relieving the souls of a people from the burden of sin and assuring them of the mercy of God; but he took care that the scape-goat should be a *goat*, and not, as polished Athens and civilized Rome, a *man*." On "the penal destruction of the Canaanites," Prof. Goldwin Smith remarks: "Had they been spared and reduced to slavery, the result, judging from analogy, would have been the deep corruption of the chosen people. With abundance of slave labor, the Jews would not have taken to industry, nor have acquired the virtues which industry alone can produce and guard. Their fate would have been like that of the Turks and other conquering hordes of the East, which, the rush of conquest once over, have sunk into mere sloth and sensuality. And the morals of the Canaanites are truly painted in the Pentateuch; the possession of such slaves would have been depraving in the highest degree." – Quoted by *Prof. George P. Fisher, in North American Review, for February*, 1882, *pp.* 184, 188. "Prof. Goldwin Smith has just observations respecting monarchy among the Hebrews. Their leaders recognized the advantages of a free commonwealth, and felt it to be more consonant with their idea and function as a people. But when the people—being what they were—preferred monarchy, monarchy was allowed. But the Hebrew kings were not oriental despots. They reigned by consent of the people. There were laws which set a limit to their prerogatives. There were fearless prophets to rebuke and denounce the proudest of them. The right of revolution was maintained.

No such man as Nebuchadnezzar would have been endured be the Hebrew people."—*Prof. George P. Fisher, in North American Review, for February*, 1882, *p.* 184. Prof. Fisher, as an orthodox writer, is here calling attention to these statements of Prof. Smith. Again, on page 182, Prof. Fisher, alluding to the statements of Prof. Goldwin Smith, says: "He justly characterizes the Old Testament legislation as a 'code of laws,' the beneficence of which is equally unapproached by any code, and, least of all, by any oriental code, not produced under the influence of Christianity." Though he tries to weaken the force of it by sophistry and base misrepresentation of the Old Testament, Prof. Carl Vogt—as quoted in a letter to the *Frankfurter Zeitung*—unintentionally pays the following tribute to Old Testament Ethics: "Wherever I met Jews I found their conduct of life the same. They are industrious, intelligent, frugal, at times to excess, charitable, little disposed to violence or crimes, and not addicted to drink. They are accused of lacking dignity, of being obsequious and cunning in trade. On the whole, they have the good qualities and faults of highly civilized nations. The picture which Europe would present if peopled exclusively by Israelites, would be a strange one. There would be no wars, and, consequently, the moral sense would not be so frequently outraged as it is now; millions of men would not be taken from the plough, the workshop and the counting-house, to bleed in battle; public debts and taxes would decrease; science, letters and arts—especially music—would be highly cultivated; industry and commerce would flourish; felonious assaults would be of rare occurrence, and crimes against property seldom accompanied by violence; owing to the effect of skillful and regular labor, combined with economy, wealth would largely accumulate—wealth that would be devoted to noble charities; there would be no conflicts between Church and State, ex-

cept, perhaps, in affairs of but little import; but, unfortunately, there would be considerable bribery and little firmness exercised by public officers. Marriages would be frequent, contracted early in life, and generally respected. As a natural result, the evils produced by immorality would be almost unknown. These characteristics, together with a few hygienic rules, would produce a beautiful and healthful people. Births would be numerous, the average duration of life would be longer, and the population would rapidly increase."

Dr. Priestley, an eminent scholar and skeptic, concedes: "They who suppose that Moses himself was the author of the institutions, civil or religious, that bear his name, and that in framing them he borrowed much from the Egyptians or other nations, must never have compared them together; otherwise, they could not have but perceived many circumstances in which they differ most essentially from them all. No heathen ever conceived an idea of so great an *object* as that of the institutions of Moses. . . . . In no system of religion besides that of Moses was purity of *morals* any part."—*Dissertation on the Mosaic Institution*—quoted in *Clarke's Commentary, Vol. I., p.* 842.

This can not better be closed than with the testimony of that believer, Sir William Jones. He was born in 1746. Was author of *Persian Grammar; Commentaries on Asiatic Poetry*, which that eminent scholar and skeptic, Eichhorn, deemed worthy of such merit that he published it at Leipsic in 1776; author of a translation of Arabic poems; contributor largely to *Asiatic Researches;* the establisher and first President of the Royal Asiatic Society, "for investigating the history, antiquities, arts, sciences and literature of Asia;" made Judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Bengal, in March, 1783; author of a translation of the ordinances of Menu in 1794, and who died in April, 1794, while engaged in making a

digest of Hindoo and Mohammedan laws; who has, even to-day, no superior as a linguist and Orientalist; of whom Lord Teignmouth, in his life of Jones (quoted on page 12 of *What Noted Men Think of the Bible*), says: "A profound jurist and linguist, an elegant poet, Sir William's name is one of the brightest ornaments of English literary history." This eminent scholar says: "I have carefully and regularly perused the Holy Scriptures, and am of opinion that the volume, independently of its divine origin, contains more sublimity, purer morality, more important history, and finer strains, both of poetry and eloquence, than could be collected within the same compass from all other books that were ever composed in any age or in any idiom. The two parts of which the Scriptures consist, are connected by a chain of compositions which bear no resemblance in form or style to any that can be produced from the stores of Grecian, Indian, Persian, or even Arabian learning. The antiquity of these compositions no man doubts; and the unrestrained application of them to events long subsequent to their publication is a solid ground of belief that they were genuine compositions, and, consequently, inspired. The connection of the Mosaic history with the gospel by a chain of sublime predictions, unquestionably ancient and manifestly fulfilled, must induce us to think the Hebrew narrative more than human in its origin, and, consequently, true in every substantial part of it, though possibly expressed in figurative language; as many learned and pious men have believed without injury, and, perhaps, with advantage to the cause of revealed religion." (By the way, this little book, whence this quotation is copied—*What Noted Men Think of the Bible*—by Prof. Luther T. Townsend, D.D., published by the Methodist Book Concern for about ten cents, ought to be widely scattered.)

4. In the fruits of ethics of the Old Testament is

FARTHER SEEN ITS SALUTARY NATURE. Among its many fruits, the following are a few:

First. The acceptance of monotheism by the Jews.

Second. The reclamation of the Jews from idolatry.

Third. With their salvation from idolatry, their freedom from the cruel and obscene rites and life of idolatry.

Fourth. The deliverance of the Jews from the most abject Egyptian slavery.

Fifth. The establishment among the Jews of the best sanitary code the world has ever known. See testimony of Dr. Richardson in the chapter of this book on the Sabbath.

Sixth. Of poor, ignorant Egyptian slaves, the Old Testament made a nation of education, refinement, wealth and civilization.

Seventh. Of tribes the Old Testament made a nation. As Max Muller remarks: "The worship of Jehovah made the Jews a peculiar people—the people separated by their God, though not by their language, from the people of Chemosh (the Moabites) and from the worshipers of Baal and Ashtaroth. It was their faith in Jehovah that changed the wandering tribes of Israel into a nation."—*Science of Religion, p.* 57. This statement of Max Muller is the more forcible from his heterodoxy, and scholarship in the study of the different religions. (The reader will not here forget the licentious, etc., religion of Ashtaroth and Baal.)

Eighth. In eradicating polygamy from among the Jews, Old Testament Ethics is manifest. Though there were then exceptions, by the time of the birth of Christ monogamy was the rule among the Jews. Under Old Testament influence, the Jews are among the very strictest adherents to monogamy.

Ninth. What is true of the eradication of polygamy from among the Jews, is equally true of ancient slavery.

Tenth. So powerful a people did the Jews become, through

Old Testament influences, that even when conquered by brute force and dispersed among other nations, it was a saying concerning them: "The conquered have given laws to the conquerers."

Eleventh. Though so much given to formalism as to crucify Christ and persecute Christianity, such was the influence of Old Testament Ethics that a pious virgin, a pious family, gave the Redeemer to the world; from the Jews came Christianity. Of no other religion was this possible.

While the expression may be made to mean too much, it is true that of Judaism came Christianity, the world's hope. The Jews were the good "olive tree."* Hence, all the first Christians—no exceptions worthy of mention—were Jews. Of the Jews came the converts before the day of Pentecost; on that day, and for several years after, the converts were gathered almost exclusively of the Jews, when the Jews were "broken off because of their unbelief" (verse 20), to be finally reunited (verse 26).

With some statements of historians, I will close this argument. The reader noticed the concession of Carl Vogt to what a people the Jews have become. Says Bissell: "The institution of slavery for native-born Israelites was abolished; . . . . alms-giving rose to the dignity of a system; and the 'virtue that showeth mercy and lendeth,' became the leading idea of righteousness."—*Apocrypha, p.* 11. Prof. Fisher says: "'Charity, compassionate love,' says Boeckh, one of the profoundest classical scholars of the present age, 'was no virtue of the ancient world. Kindly sayings can be met with

*By this I mean the *converted* Jews, composing the *first churches*, gathered during the first years of the Church—under the ministry of John, Christ, and the first years of the ministry of the Apostles. They were "the root" (Rom. xi. 18); they were the "first fruit" (v. 16), typified by the "first fruits" of Lev. xxiii. 17; Neh. x. 37.

as blossoms are found on the high Alps in the midst of the snow. . . . The few examples of benevolence (in heathen world) on a broad scale, which are often referred to, are generally more apparent than real.'"—*North American Review.* Lecky, an infidel, says of Greece and Rome: "There, as elsewhere, charitable institutions were absolutely unknown. The infant was entirely unprotected, and infanticide having been—at least, in the case of deformed children—expressly authorized by Plato and Aristotle, was seldom regarded as a crime. The practice of bringing up orphans avowedly for prostitution was equally common."—*Hist. Rationalism, Vol. II., pp.* 233, 235; also, *Hist. Europ. Mor., by Lecky, Vol. II., pp.* 82–84, 87. Of the time of the Christian era: "The Jews enjoyed a freedom from military service and other civil privileges that were not granted to others. Their successful industry and commercial prosperity were proverbial, and must have made a profound impression upon their heathen neighbors."—*Bissell on the Apocrypha, p.* 35. The Jews had been so much merged by the Old Testament into the love of mankind, that, for their salvation, they had been the cause of the translation of the Old Testament into Greek. And Philo expresses satisfaction that thus "the means of salvation" had become accessible "to the greater part, if not, indeed, to the whole of mankind."—*Idem, p.* 35. *Nowhere in Jewish history* did the Grecian, Roman or Egyptian, or, to no small extent, the modern spirit of conquering and ruling other nations appear. Their ethics, their history have ever been the very reverse of this national robbery. That they had to subdue the Canaanites is no invalidation of this. Under the "destruction of the Canaanites," we have seen that this was not the *rule or characteristic* of Jewish life; but the exception, for a judicial, wise purpose, and by divine command.

History incontrovertibly proves that the ethics of the Old

Testament, in its influences upon the Jews, proves itself good by its fruits.

Turning to its influences upon Christians, this is no less true. Jesus Christ and his apostles preached from the Old Testament. Thus the Old Testament entered largely into the ethical food of the first Christians. So Paul says of the Old Testament: "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation. All Scripture—*i. e.*, the whole Old Testament—is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God—*i. e.*, the true ethical man—may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works"—*i. e.*, to the true ethical life. 2 Tim. iii. 14–17; Luke xxiv. 27, 32, 45; John v. 39; Acts xvii. 2, 11; xviii. 24, 28; 2 Pet. i. 20; 1 Cor. ix.; the whole of Hebrews. Let the reader remember that all the Scriptures to which these references refer are the Old Testament. Many good-meaning people have scarcely the faintest idea of the extent to which the Old Testament contributed to the ethics of early Christian lives. It is certain that to the ethics of early Christian lives the Old Testament *essentially* contributed. This is no less true of the Church of all ages. When the Son of man shall come, it will be equally true. Hand in hand, one revealed book of ethics, are the Old and the New Testaments. The reader who is disposed to thoroughly sound how deeply the early Christians drank of Old Testament ethics—in addition to the Scriptures above referred to—may do so by the use of his reference Bible, in which he will find that the doctrinal and practical exhortations of the New Testament are nearly all based on some Old Testament Scripture.

The fruits of the Old Testament for all ages are, light for heathen and infidel darkness; moral purity for heathen and infidel pollution; the freedom of righteousness for the bond-

age of heathen and infidel iniquity; civilization for heathen and infidel barbarism; for heathen and infidel despair and woe, joy and hope. For the wild heathen and infidel ethical desert, the Old Testament gives us the ethical land, flowing with milk and honey. From the *throne* of God and the Lamb, upon this barren heathen and infidel ethical desert, the Old Testament opens the "pure river of water of life, clear as crystal." With the Sun of righteousness its banks are all sunny, growing the delicious ethical fruits for "the healing of the nations."

But, turning to other "sacred books," their influence has, in general, been bad. Whatever—if any—good influence they may have had has been but little, and that little due to a dim recognition of some parts of the ethics which we find in the Old Testament. Concerning the *Vedas*, which infidels delight to laud, the highest American Sanscrit scholar, Prof. Whitney—with all Orientalists—says: "They have exerted comparatively very little restraining or guiding influence upon the moral or spiritual development of India."—*Orient. Ling. Studies, Vol. I., p.* 62. And Prof. Whitney says: "The Koran had not borrowed enough from the Bible to make it long a safe guide to the human mind, and the furious zeal which it inspired was much more destructive than constructive."—*Idem, Vol. II., p.* 10. The morality of India and China are too well known to call for much notice here. Barbarians in morals, barbarians in civilization. "When the Duke of Wellington first went to India, he made the remark that the Hindoos labored under two great defects in their moral character—that they did not care for life, and that they did not care for truth."—*Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, by Mozley*—taken from *Wellington's Supplementary Despatches, Vol. I., p.* 16. As to the Chinese, an observer of singular accuracy says: "With a general regard to outward decency, they are vile and polluted

in a shocking degree. . . . . They feel no shame in being detected in a lie, though they have not gone quite so far as not to know when they do lie. . . . . There is nothing which tries one so much who lives among them as their disregard for truth. . . . . Their proneness in this regard is one of the greatest obstacles to their permanent improvement as a people, while it constantly disheartens those who are making efforts to teach them."—*Dr. S. Wells Williams' Middle King., Vol. II., p.* 96, in *Chr. Miss., by Prof. Seelye.* See also *Mencius IV.*, 1, 12; *China, by Prof. Kidd, p.* 205; *Travels in the Chinese Empire, Vol. II., p.* 326, *by the Abbe Huc; Confucius, by Legge, p.* 114; *The Chinese, by Sir John Davis; The Foreign Missionary, by Knowlton*—in fact, any reliable authority on the Chinese. Look where you will, you can see no heathen or infidel ethical tree, the bows of which are loaded down with delicious ethical fruit, as we everywhere see the Old Testament tree loaded down. We shall look to see only a few scattering ethical fruits on the heathen tree, and only poison upon the infidel. "*Ye shall know them by their fruits.*" As Prof. Mozley remarks of the superiority of the Old Testament fruits: "Unexampled as it was in the world, and without a parallel in any other nation."—*Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, p.* 221.

5. THIS BOOK CAN NOT WELL BE CONCLUDED WITHOUT CALLING ATTENTION TO OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS AS A MIRACLE AND A CONCLUSIVE PROOF OF ITS SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN.

With the fact before us, that in the moral as much as in the material world every effect must have an adequate cause, how are we to account for the incomparable superiority of Old Testament Ethics? If they are the product of the uninspired human mind, as it will not be denied that the mind of other nations was naturally equal to the Jewish mind, why did not *some* other nation produce something, at least, somewhat near

the incomparable ethics of the Old Testament? If Old Testament morals are not a supernatural revelation, why did the Apocrypha, from the *Jewish* mind, fall so far below the canonical books—below the Old Testament? If Old Testament Ethics are not of supernatural origin, why do infidel ethics of all ages appear so infinitely below Old Testament Ethics? See especially Chapter III. of this book. Outside of the Bible, there is no more recognition of and agreement upon *fundamental* laws of morality than there were thousands of years ago. And Lecky and other infidels concede that reason never can settle upon a universal, unchangeable ethical code or standard. See Chapter IV. of this book. Without reference to the supernatural origin, the incomparable superiority of Old Testament morals is as great an enigma as a world without a Creator; a design without a designer; resurrection from the dead without him who is "the resurrection and the life." In fact, Old Testament is a resurrection of ethics from the grave in which sin had buried it. Mozley well remarks of the Old Testament: "Unexampled as it was in the world, and without a parallel in any other nation, shows that there was some peculiar power at work in the Jewish dispensation, and that the people had been under a special, educating Providence."—*Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, p.* 221. As an infidel, Dryden says of the Bible:

> "Whence but from heaven, could men unskilled in arts,
> In several ages born, in several parts,
> Weave such agreeing truths? or how, or why,
> Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie?
> Unasked their pains, ungrateful their advice,
> Starving their gain and martyrdom their price."

Another poet writes:

"'Tis Revelation satisfies all doubts,
Explains all mysteries except her own,
And so illumes the path of life,
That fools discover it and stray no more."

"What glory gilds the sacred page!
Majestic, like the sun,
It gives a light to every age;
It gives, but borrows none."

"Most wondrous book! bright candle of the Lord!
Star of eternity! the only star
By which the bark of man could navigate
The sea of life, and gain the coast of bliss securely."

These lines cover the whole Bible. The morals of the Old Testament are as great a miracle as the resurrection of Jesus Christ. With my eye upon the bar of God, from my very heart I declare, "*I know the Old Testament of God by its incomparable ethics.*"

THE END.

CONTENTS AND INDEX.

CHAPTER I.

OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS GERMINAL AND PREPARATORY TO NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS. . . . . Page 7

Meaning of the word ethics—p. 7. Difference between ethics and manners—p. 7. Jesus developed the moral ideas of the Old Testament—p. 9. Meaning of πληρωσαι—*pleerosai*—to fulfill—p. 9. Skeptical concessions—pp. 9, 15. The Hebrews of early ages could not bear a fully developed revelation—p. 10. Necessity for a progressive revelation for imperfect humanity—pp. 10–15.

CHAPTER II.

INDISPENSABLE RULES TO OLD TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION. . . . . Page 17

Rules as laid down by Blackstone, Kent, Hedge, Prof. George P. Fisher, Max Muller—pp. 17–22.

CHAPTER III.

THE OLD TESTAMENT LAYS THE ONLY ETHICAL BASIS. Page 23

God the supreme moral Governor—p. 23. Moral law necessary to moral government; only God can make and enforce moral law. Hume's and Confucius' ideas on moral law. The moral law is real, is immutable; and, in so teaching the moral law, the Old Testament is superior to heathenism and infidelity—pp. 24–30. Statements of Julius Muller, Underwood, Hobbes, Herbert Spencer, Hooker, Hume, Voltaire, Confucius,

Buddha—pp. 25–30. Testimony of Julius Muller, Wuttke, Lecky, Macaulay, Buckle, Legge, Max Muller, pp. 25–30. Views of the Reformers—p. 25. Old Testament Ethics based upon human responsibility—p. 30. Testimony of Wuttke and Kant—pp. 30, 31. Old Testament Ethics based upon the moral nature of man and the reality of sin—p. 31. Meaning of Hebrew and Greek words for sin—pp. 31, 32. Testimony of Gesenius, De Wette, Hupfeld, Julius Muller, Hengstenberg and Harless—pp. 31, 32. Infidelity and heathenism denying the existence of man's moral nature and the reality of sin—pp. 33–47. Statements of Haeckel, Vogt, Moleschott, Lecky, Wuttke, Max Muller, *The Nation*, Mozley, Shelley, *Campbell and Owen Debate*, Buckle, Lizzie Doten, Le Play, Voltaire, Gregg, Joseph Cook, Goethe, Carlyle, Robert Patterson, Emerson, Weiss, Theodore Parker, Frothingham, *Banner of Light*, McDonald, John Adams, *Dyckink's Encyclop.*, *Hildreth's Hist. U. S.*, *Encyclop. Britannica*, Byron, Hume, Andrew Fuller, Rousseau, *New York Ledger*, *Thiers' Hist. French Rev.*, *Allison's Hist. French Rev.*, Draper, Abbott (of the *Index*), *Christian Intelligencer*, *Bancroft's Hist. U. S.*, Meander, Plato, Maximus Tyrius, Lucretius, Tyndall—pp. 33–47. Incontrovertible proof of Tom Paine's blackness of character—p. 41. Most leading infidels immoral—pp. 37–47. Comment on Emerson's obituaries—p. 40. Byron on removal of Tom Paine's bones—p. 42.

For the model of man's life Old Testament Ethics presents God's holiness—p. 47. Hebrew words for holiness—pp. 48–49. Comparison of the God of the Old Testament with heathen gods—pp. 47–52. Statements of Gesenius, Julius Muller, Longfellow, Mosheim, Wuttke, Prof. Whitney, Prof. Moffat, Prof. Robertson Smith.

Old Testament Ethics teaches that the doctrine of future rewards and punishments is necessary to ethics—pp. 52, 55. Statements of Montesquieu, Shedd, Bates, Hume, Draper, Buckle, Lecky, Benjamin Franklin, Voltaire, Wuttke, Theodore Parker—pp. 52–54.

Old Testament Ethics based on humility—pp. 55–59. Hebrew words for humility—p. 56. Heathenism and infidelity

know nothing of humility—p. 55. Statements of Gesenius, Hume, Wuttke, Lecky—p. 56–57. Pride in intellectual powers one of the sins of our times—p. 56. Old Testament Ethics presents repentance for sin as necessary to ethics—pp. 59–64. Hebrew words for repentance—pp. 59, 60. Heathenism and infidelity know no repentance—p. 61. Statements of Gesenius, Harper, Julius Muller, Moleschott, Theodore Parker, Harless, Wuttke, Lecky—pp. 60, 61.

Regeneration fundamental to Old Testament Ethics—pp. 61, 64. Heathenism and infidelity know no regeneration—pp. 62–64. Statements of Julius Muller, Goethe, Ingersoll, Byron, Cicero, Harless, Aristotle, Lecky, Celsus, Prof. Moffat, Buddhism—pp. 60–65.

The Old Testament presents faith as fundamental to ethics —pp. 65, 66. Hebrew for faith—p. 65. Belief and unbelief essential elements of moral character; *why* damned for unbelief—pp. 65–86. Greek words for belief and unbelief—pp. 67–69. A bad heart disbelieves good—pp. 65–87. Statements of Gesenius, Wuttke, Liddell and Scott, Boise, Robinson, Greenfield, Winer, McCosh, Bishop Wilson, Greenleaf, Lord Bacon, Joseph Cook, Voltaire, Strauss, Haeckel, Huxley, Max Muller, Napoleon, Ruskin, Robert Dale Owen, Lecky, Sir Philip Sidney, F. W. Robertson, Lycurgus, Cicero, Aristotle, Plato, Voltaire, Hume, Hobbes, Draper, Gregg, Gen. Charles Lee, Andrew Fuller, Buckle, Farrar, *New York Ledger*, Bolingbroke, Emerson, Goethe, Bancroft, Sir Humphrey Davy, the dying Karen—pp. 65–87.

The Old Testament presents prayer as necessary to ethics—pp. 87, 88. The philosophy of prayer—pp. 87-105. What is prayer?—p. 87. Origin of prayer in the heart—p. 88. Prayer natural to man when in harmony with God and himself—p, 88. Prayer indispensable to moral development—pp. 89-93. Direct answers to prayer and reflex influence of prayer —pp. 89–93, 100, 102. Prayer, natural law and science; *what is natural law?* etc.—pp. 93–95. Old Testament and natural law and science—p. 95. Prayer over physical nature—pp. 98–104. Only the frivolous Epicureans have ever denied the doctrine of prayer—p. 93. Statements of Harless, Spencer,

Walker, Shakespeare, Medhurst, *Popular Science Monthly*, Tyndall, Lecky, Cowper, Morse, D'Aubigne, Wuttke, Draper, Noah Webster, Burke, the Duke of Argyll, Reid, John Stuart Mill, Paley, John Hall, J. W. Dawson, Grove, *Princeton Review*, Lionel Beale, Horace, A. J. Frost and Tennyson—pp. 87–105.

Jesus Christ and the atonement necessary to Old Testament Ethics—pp. 105, 120–122. Hebrew words for atonement—p. 105. The atonement made necessary to man's peace by his fallen nature—pp. 106–108. The atonement demonstrates the holiness of the moral law; the blackness of sin; the certainty of the punishment of sin; the terrible nature of the punishment of sin; the moral significance and dignity of man; the blessings of moral obedience; the love of God; the openness of everything we think, say or do to the moral Governor and Judge; the universality of the moral law; the universality of the moral nature and brotherhood of man; our duty to the fallen; and saves from despair—pp. 108–114. Answer to the main infidel objections to the atonement—pp. 113–120. The infidel position on the atonement fatal to all morality—pp. 118, 119. Death-bed repentance unreliable—p. 117. Statements of Gesenius, Smeaton, Shakespeare, Goethe, Lecky, Martin, Hovey, Lord Bacon, Milton, Hume, Jackson, Graves, Abraham Booth, Buckle, Harless—pp. 105–120.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SABBATH ESSENTIAL TO OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS. Page 123

The Sabbath calls man's attention to the spiritual as above the material; affords opportunity for religious instruction, meditation and devotion, for rest of mind and body, rest for the laboring animals; is a priceless boon to the poor, securing them family life, domestic love and purity; is a constant *rebuke to the heartless capitalist and a protection against him* – pp. 123–135. The Sabbath *the remedy* for strikes and the deepening antipathy between capitalist and laborers – p. 127, *et al.* Heathen and infidel ethics know nothing of the Sabbath—p. 123. Statements of Wuttke, Gilfillan, Gregg, Le Play, Black-

stone, Lecky, Wayland, *Hall's Journal of Health*, Ewald, Hovey, Prud'hon, Niemeyer, Macaulay, Ernest Curtius, Sir David Wilkie, Charles Biaconi, Dr. Benjamin Richardson, Corliss, Ernst Keil—pp. 123–135.

CHAPTER V.

REVELATION ESSENTIAL TO OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS. Page 136

Certainty necessary to authority and obedience; all ethics outside of the Bible, at best, dependent no reason being infallible, and, therefore, uncertain and weak in its hold on the heart. Why what was good in heathen ethics had so little influence on men's lives. In being a certain ethics, Old Testament Ethics incomparably superior to heathen and infidel ethics, in their best form—p. 136–138. All reasonings run down to sophisms, atheism and immorality—p. 137. Lecky admits: "Nature does not tell man that it is wrong to slay, without provocation, our fellow-man"—p. 137. Buckle's statement that there is no absolute standard of morals—p. 137. Statements of Wuttke, Lecky, Draper, Hume, Buckle, Gregg, Blackstone and Walker—pp. 136–138.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS THE CONSTITUTION OF OLD TESTAMENT ETHICAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS. . Page 139

Meaning and comprehensiveness of the commandments—pp. 139–146. Nothing in Old Testament Ethics can conflict with these commandments—pp. 139–146. In this respect, superior to all heathen and infidel ethics—pp. 139–146. Statements of Stebbins, Davidson, *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Fairbairn, Hengstenberg, Bahr—pp. 139–146.

CHAPTER VII.

ETHICAL NATURE AND DESIGN OF OLD TESTAMENT CEREMONIES. . . . . Page 147

The ceremonies of the Old Testament representations of inward, spiritual things—pp. 147–153. No human sacrifices

permitted—all conforming to spiritual purity—pp. 147–153. Purity of heart and life necessary to the offerer of Old Testament sacrifices—pp. 151–153. *Radically* different from heathen sacrificial systems—pp. 150, 151. Origin of sacrifice—pp. 147–149. Statements of C. O. Muller, Fairbairn, Bahr, Plato, Lord Bacon, Milton, *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Robertson Smith, Stebbins and S. Ives Curtis—pp. 147–153.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOME OF THE MISCELLANEOUS HEBREW LAWS RELATING TO ETHICS. . . . . Page 154

Laws of charity—pp. 154–158. Superior to all heathen and infidel charity—pp. 157, 158. Hebrew laws of justice—pp. 158–171. They were tender, impartial, wise; superior to all heathen ideas, to infidel and modern ideas—pp. 158–171. Meaning of Hebrew words and better translations made—pp. 154, 156, 163. Statements of Thompson, Adam Clarke, Bissell, *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Blackstone, *Minutes* of the Old School Presbyterians, Bishop Coxe, Lecky, Tholuck, Confucius, Josephus, Kitto, Mozley, Robertson Smith, the Koran and Michaelis—pp. 147–169.

CHAPTER IX.

OLD TESTAMENT CARE AND TENDERNESS FOR ANIMALS. Page 172

Superior to heathenism and infidelity in such care—pp. 172, 173. Statements of Wuttke and Lecky—pp. 172, 173.

CHAPTER X.

OLD TESTAMENT LAWS CONCERNING TREATMENT OF ENEMIES, HEATHEN AND STRANGERS. . . . Page 174

No revenge; one law for all; the golden rule to govern all these relations—pp. 174–180. Christ and his apostles taught the Old Testament law and did not, *in the least*, abrogate it; *especial* exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, which, by

some, has been regarded an abrogation of Old Testament Ethics—pp. 175–180. Old Testament treatment of enemies, heathen and strangers superior to that of heathenism and infidelity—pp. 178–180. Statements of Tholuck, Adam Clarke, Bissell, G. W. Clarke, Luther, Bucer, Piscatar, Calov, Tirinus, Bengel, B. Crucius, Maldonatus, Este, a Lapide, Grotius, Episcopius, Barnes, Stier, Ernesti, Meyer, De Wette, Mimonides, Prideaux, Hesiod, Plutarch, Xenophon, Plato, Wuttke, Confucius and Legge—pp. 174–180.

CHAPTER XI

OLD TESTAMENT AND SERVANTS. . . Page 181

The Old Testament regulated and cared for the condition of servants, and, finally, rooted out the institution of Hebrew slavery—pp. 181–191. Hebrew servants placed, by Old Testament Ethics, in a much better condition than other ancient slaves generally were—pp. 182–191. Hebrew words and corrections of translations—pp. 183, 184, 188. Statements of Conant, *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Hadley, *New York Rev.*, Gesenius, Aristotle, Hume, Kent, Wuttke, Mielziner, Blackstone, Lecky, Wilson and Draper—pp. 181–191.

CHAPTER XII.

WOMEN, MARRIAGE, THE FAMILY, CHASTITY, ACCORDING TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. . . . . Page 192

Both man and woman put to death for adultery; parties, guilty of fornication, compelled to marry each other; death for rape; death for unnatural crimes; incest a crime—p. 192. Monogamy the Old Testament law. But one woman created for but one man; polygamy originated in a period of darkness and crime; kings forbidden to multiply wives; widow of one man mentioned, but *never* widows of one man; no polygamists in the ark; Job a monogamist; after the flood, they began as monogamists; polygamy recorded as a warning against it; monogamy commended as a life of deepest joy; the eunuch state a slur on polygamy; marrying two sisters prohibited

while both are living; the Hebrew forbids, absolutely, polygamy; polygamy not general among the Hebrews—pp. 192–195. The position of Old Testament wives eminently just and happy, better than in our times; answer to infidel objections—pp. 195–201. Old Testament position of women in general; concubinage; power of parent to sell his daughter; wives and husbands not sold from each other; high praise of woman by the Old Testament, and the high position it gives her; divorce, etc.—pp. 201–206. Children under the Old Testament; their condition wisely regulated—p. 206. Infidel objection: stoning the disobedient son explained and justified —pp. 207, 208. Superior condition of Old Testament women, children and the family to that of heathenism and infidelity —pp. 207–216. Meaning of Hebrew words and translations corrected—pp. 194, 205, 207. Statements of Adam Clarke, Harless, Michaelis, *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Tholuck, G. W. Clarke, Scott, Stier, Whitby, Beza, Bengel, Hovey, Haley, Lecky, Kent, Confucius, Legge, Milman, Mozley, Felton, Schaff, Wuttke, Wilson, Draper, Fisher, Underwood, Hadley, Michelet, Merivale, Max Muller, Guizot, *Hebrew Student*, Miles Grant, McDonald, Le Play, Dryden, Walter Scott, Reed, Taine, Macaulay, Buckle, Bancroft—pp. 192–216.

CHAPTER XIII.

ANSWER TO INFIDEL OBJECTIONS WHICH ARE ESPECIALLY URGED. . . . . Page 217

Hebrews taking "to themselves female captives"—pp. 217–220. Slaughter of the Midianites and saving alive, for themselves, young female captives"—pp. 220–222. Hosea commanded to take "a wife of whoredoms"—pp. 222, 223. Marriage of a brother to his deceased brother's wife—pp. 223, 224. "Abraham's marriage to his sister"—pp. 224, 225. Lot and his daughter's incestuous act—p. 225. The horrible things recorded in Judges xix., xx. and xxi.—pp. 225, 226. Extirpation of the Canaanites—pp. 226–231. "Children" slain for mocking the prophet—pp. 231–233. Slaying of seducers to idolatry—pp. 233–235. Slaying of Saul's bloody house—p.

235. Slaying of Achan's family; slaying of Ahab's sons; slaying of the house of Ahaziah, etc.—p. 235. Infidelity guilty of the *most fiendish and wholesale murder recorded in history*—pp. 236–238. Old Testament and human sacrifices; a special examination of the reputed sacrifice of the daughter of Jephthah, clearly proving him clear of the crime—pp. 238–253. Statements of *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Halley, Delitzsch, Bleek, Davidson, Kimchi, Knobel, Hengstenberg, Origen, Junius, Burkhardt, Keil, Gesenius, Underwood, Conant, Jerome, Josephus, Robertson Smith, Harless, Fairbairn, Thomas Arnold, Stanley, Ewald, Adam Clarke, Goldsmith, Michaelis, Webster, Jahn, Thiers, Buchner, Allison, Abbot, Wilson, May, Farrar, White, Wuttke, Shedd, Le Play, Bancroft, Franklin, Warburton, Lange, Bush, Murphy, Kurtz, Eusebius, Porphyry, Harper, Cassel, Grotius, Le Clerc, Lilienthal, Saalschutz, Schudt, Houbigant, Waterland, Levi Ben Gersom, Bechai, Drusius, de Dieu, Bishop Hall, Dr. Hales, Richter—pp. 217–247. David's character and life—"your man after God's own heart"—pp. 247–253. David one of the best of men; in character and life far above heathen and infidel kings. Statements of Hackett, *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, Carlyle, Davidson, Michaelis, Chandler, Dantz, Adam Clarke, Haley, Kennicott—pp. 248–253. The imprecatory Psalms—pp. 253–256. Those Psalms the same spirit as the New Testament—pp. 253, 254. Same as the angels and the saved in the blessed word utter—p. 254. They are what all *good* men feel—pp. 254-256. Statements of Adam Clarke, G. W. Clarke, Bengel, Catiline, Milton, Joseph Cook, De Wette, Lowth, Max Muller, Conant—pp. 253–257. Sacrifice—"curse on child-birth"—on occasion of child-birth—p. 257. Explained and justified—pp. 257, 258. Statements of Leyrer, Haley, Adam Clarke, *et al.* Giving and selling animals for food to strangers which had died of themselves—pp. 259, 260. "Borrowing" of the Egyptians with "no intention of returning"—p. 260. Statement of Gesenius—p. 260. Hebrew words explained, false translations in this chapter corrected—pp. 220, 223, 224, 232, 240, 241, 245, 246, 247, 252, 253, 259, 260.

CHAPTER XIV.

OLD TESTAMENT ETHICS IN BASIS AND STRUCTURE MORALLY FAULTLESS, SPOTLESS AND HOLY. . . . Page 261

An examination of the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, in which they appear inferior to Old Testament Ethics —pp. 261–263. Yet this examination bears testimony to the purity of Old Testament Ethics, in its influence on the Apocrypha, rendering that superior to ethics of heathen "sacred books," philosophies, and to that of infidel writers—pp. 262, 263. Infidel and other testimony to the incomparable superiority of Old Testament Ethics to all non-Bible ethics—pp. 263–267. Fruits of Old Testament Ethics producing eleven *essentials* to ethics and civilization—*the* test of its ethics—pp. 267–273. Fruits of Old Testament Ethics proved far superior to fruits of ethics of heathen philosophers, "sacred books," the Koran and infidelity—pp. 263–273. Old Testament Ethics a moral MIRACLE *and demonstration of its supernatural origin;* such a demonstration that, on its ethics *alone*, we must decide the Old Testament a supernatural revelation of God—pp. 273–275. Testimony of Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Bissell, Weiss, Rousseau, Goldwin Smith, George P. Fisher, Vogt, Priestley, Teignmouth, Townsend, Max Muller, Boeckh, Lecky, Whitney, Mozley, Wellington, S. Wells Williams, Prof. Seelye, Mencius, Prof. Kidd, Abbe Huc, Confucius, Legge, Sir John Davis, Knowlton, Orientalists generally, Dryden—pp. 261–275.

INDEX TO GREEK WORDS

Which are Defined or Translated.

	PAGE		PAGE
ἦθος	7	ἄπιστος	69
πληρωσαὶ	9	ἀπειθέω	69
πληροῦν	9	ἐλπίς	67
ψυχή	12	Θεόε	163
πνεῦμα	12	επέτρεψεν . . .	196
ἁμαρτία	31	τὸ ἀντιπεπονθός . .	177
πίστος	67, 69	ὠφελεῖν μὲν τοὺς φίλους	179
πιστεύω	67	βλάπτειν δὲ τοὺς ἐχθρούς	179
πιστός	68	ἕκαστος ὑμῶν . . .	245
πιστής	68	ἕκαστος αὐτῶν . .	245
ἀπιστία	69	βαπτιθήτω . . .	245
ἀπιστέω	69	αἰτήσει	260

Index to Hebrew Words and Phrases

Which are Defined or Translated.

	PAGE
חָטָא	31, 32
עָוֹן	31
פֶּשַׁע	31
אָשַׁם	31
קָדוֹשׁ	48, 49
חָנַף	48
יְהוָה טִקְדְּשׁוּ	49
חָסִיד	49
רָפַס	56
דָּכָא	56
שָׁחָה	56
צָנַע	56
עָנָה	56
שָׁלַף	56
נָחַם	59
אָמוֹן	65
אָמַן	65
כָּפַר	105
פְּאֵה	154
נָשַׁךְ	156
נָשָׁה	156
אֱלֹהִים	163
וְנִמְפַּר	183
בָּגַד	184
עֶבֶד	188
טוֹב	194
אֶל־אַחֹתָהּ	194
מָרָה	207
זָלַל	207
חָפַצְתָּ	220
זוֹנִים	223
בִּפְנֵי	224
קָטָן	232
נְעָרִים	232
נַעַר קָטָן	232
חָרַם	240
אֲשֶׁר יַחֲרֹם מִן הָאָדָם	241
ו	246
תָּנָה	246
קוּן	246
סָפַר	246
נָהָה	246
אָנָה	246
בָּכָה	246
נִבְלָה	259
מוּת	259
מָוֶת	259
שָׁאַל	260

Agents Wanted for the Foregoing Book!

GOOD PAY!

ADDRESS THE AUTHOR FOR TERMS.

Attention, All!

The author of the foregoing book has, during the past several years, given especial attention to the origin, the nature of the Devil; where he is, and the nature of his works and kingdom. He intends, as soon as he can get a sufficient number of pledges to buy the book, to publish a small book upon the subject. It will sell at about 25 cents. If you wish a copy of this book, and desire to see it published, please, at once, send your pledge to the author,

W. A. JARREL, Greenville, Texas.

Also, if you desire a book upon the "Fruits of Christianity and Infidelity Compared," send your pledge to take a copy of the author's work when out. The MS. is full of rare historical information, and should be in every household. It will sell at $1.50 per volume.

ESPECIAL ATTENTION OF BAPTISTS!

There are several books which prove there has been a succession of Baptists from apostolic times to the present. But, since they were written, a few new objections to the succession have been presented, and old ones have been shifted. Besides, some new collections of historians and historical discoveries have been since made, which are very valuable to the succession. To embody these in a convenient, convincing form, answer the latest objections, and present a better array of Biblical testimony, a new book is needed. This should be a little book, which can be sold for 50 or 75 cents. The author of the foregoing book, having given especial attention to the subject for more than twelve years, has collected much valuable matter for such a book, and will publish it as soon as he receives a sufficient number of pledges to buy a copy, that he feels will secure him against financial loss. Send your pledge, name, and address for it. For each of the above books he now solicits only pledges—the money to be sent as soon as they are in print. Remember to address,

W. A. JARREL, Greenville, Texas.

Date Due

MAR 4 - 1966
APR 2 1966
JUL 6 1973
NOV 2 9 1982
JUN 0 8 1993

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0022539 6

221.817
J37

Jarrel, Willis Anselm

AUTHOR

Old Testament ethics vindicated.

TITLE

221.817
J37 Jarrel, Willis Anselm
Old Testament ethics
vindicated.

6085